

The
American Historical Review

THE EDITORIAL FUNCTION IN UNITED STATES
HISTORY¹

THE long line of my abler predecessors in office has given expression to many views and convictions. There are definitions of history, the application of historical principles, the interpretation of periods or of events, and experiment in forecasting the future in terms of the past. Scholar, publicist, and public servant have expressed their beliefs, outlined their hopes, and even intimated their disappointments in historical language. After such a series of treatments the field has been so well gleaned as to leave little yet to be garnered. If therefore I say a word for an historical agency on which almost no words have been spent, my apology must cover at once the poverty of the subject and the comparatively low rank of the agency. I refer to the editor of original sources of history, the ginning or picking machine which deals with the raw material, the first stage toward the warp and woof of historical writing.

Let us start with something definite. "Was it you", wrote an Englishman to Joseph Jefferson, the actor, "or was it your grandfather, who wrote the Declaration of Independence?" The inquirer and the question are always with us and one of the objects of writing and teaching history is to make both harmless, if not impossible. And the lowest round of the ladder of accomplishment is the editor. He assumes the existence of the anxious inquirer, he seeks to measure his wants, and he frames the answer on such a plane as to hit the average degree of ignorance. "Ignorance", wrote Emerson in his journal, "is but an appetite which God made us to gratify." The editor is a source of information and a measure of quantity suited to a dose. A physician selects his remedies on case practice, on a range of experience which has eliminated

¹ Presidential address read before the American Historical Association, at Philadelphia, December 27, 1917.

every factor of doubt but the personal equation of the subject. The giver of information has few rules based on experience for his guidance, and has a double personal equation to meet—that of his subject and that of his questioner. No wonder the failures are many.

The art is comparatively new, for it arose out of myth and fable and is still painfully groping towards truth. Evolutionists tell us that the development of moral concepts has been as gradual and certain as the development of physical characteristics, and some would lay down a rule of thumb to show how the ideas of truth, right, and justice have been evolved from moral nescience. What would the writer of history not give for such a standard or measure! The pleasure and the relief of being able to determine thus almost mechanically the degree of faith to be given to this or that relator; the delight of placing him in his proper stage of development and the mastery of purpose which would follow—what boons to the plodding reader who must rest his story upon what others, of another time and place, have related. The strata of dependence thus defined would mean a scientific test for reliability, something far beyond the existing method of setting relator against relator and accepting the mean as truth.

Three centuries ago, before there was a wide public to be gulled, the little circle of readers was given on the death of a great man a volume of his testament or parting advice. The contents had just enough verisimilitude to be accepted in part, and the advice was wholly interested. The practice common in its day on the Continent of Europe easily slipped into the later form of memoirs, and from the memoirs came biography. To pass upon the career of a public man immediately after his death involves no light task. The secretarial writer, of which Boswell is such a shining example, may be truthful and interesting; but if he is sincere and loyal he will not lightly relate what may tell against his employer. That appeal to prurient curiosity which finds a market in sensation, has been framed in many ways, and still attracts support. A Pepys holds up a personal mirror with the reflecting surface towards himself, and unconsciously gives material for judging others and his own times such as no serious-minded historian could give and such as no writer on Pepys's period can neglect. The little has become the important.

The United States has not been rich in self-written history, nor is the little it possesses, of startling moment. An explanation offered by some declares the lack of real interest in American history. However rich in pictures and incidents it does not present

flashes and explosions of overwhelming importance. Another explanation is that its people have been too occupied in opening territory to settlement and development to expend much energy on recording and explaining the course of events, much less the participation in the struggle where the overscrupulous were doomed to defeat. A third would say that a democracy is against good history, for it means a slow vulgarizing of the best. No such explanations will account for the absence of those willing and able to relate their own careers after their own point of view. Their names should be legion. The foreign visitor, in the rawest period of our growth, has not failed in picturesque, even lurid contrast, and has not found us inarticulate on ourselves or bashful of suggesting our merits. If the tone has been one of bluster rather than of philosophic analysis, it is genuine and not assumed, even to the wincing at the reflection returned by the not too faultless mirror.

In colonial New England publicity in the religious experiences of members or would-be members of the churches was exacted. If printed they take rank with the confessions of condemned criminals just reprieved, interesting not for their content, but for the state of mind and surroundings they show. They constitute a necessary item in the social history of the time, a crude form of the third degree, by which it was hoped a corner of the curtain of the soul, the token of immortal man, would be raised. The diaries, chiefly kept in interleaved almanacs by the ministers, were never intended for the public eye, and rarely rise above the level of a record of church ministration, with items of farm and household of a singularly bald nature. Once in a great while some one has the itch of putting all his thoughts and feelings on paper, and in seeking to imitate St. Augustine in frankness and scope, presents the most repellent features of religious ecstasism. Sainthood and martyrdom are able to endure that form of exhibition; but the atmosphere of early New England lacks in the quality which makes martyrdom picturesque; and this self-immolation to dogma long since passed away leaves the reader cold, even in a critical frame of mind. Did the situation of soul really demand this suffering? Is it not the symptom of physical derangement so easily mistaken for a divine afflatus? Of the sincerity of the sufferer there need be no doubt; but for permanent effect the acting is a little overdone.

Whence comes this expansiveness which often mounts to the grotesque; this tendency to publicity of thought and action? It is not English, for that people avoid exhibitions of feeling lest they make themselves ridiculous. It is not French, for they have a better

sense of finish and proportion. It is not Scottish, for they are too canny to waste even emotion without some definite return. The Irish have a humor that saves them from ridicule, though it does not endow them with the needed balance-wheel of wisdom. The sentiment of Germany overruns proper bounds, but is not reflected in the leading examples of American self-written biography. The American expression is peculiar, a proper accompaniment of a territory almost without limits. Virgin land at settlement, it had a strong influence on those who came to it. Its symbol is a screaming eagle, and who would blame an eagle for screaming in boundless space? Every American claims the right of free utterance. As a child he has used it, as a man he has abused it, the only restraint being a wholesome fear of the law of libel or an appeal to the medieval and murderous code of honor. Even this right of utterance is quite modern.

Censorship of the press, one stage in the development, is an historical survival, and in English-speaking countries (except Ireland) is merely of historical importance. Liberty "to know, to utter and to argue" Milton placed above all other liberties; but so long as it could be interpreted by an autocratic ruler, by virtue of an undefined general prerogative, the liberty existed only in name. Sir Thomas More in his *Utopia* made it punishable by death to speak against the ruling power, and by one of those strange sequences of events he was himself brought to trial for countenancing the pretensions of a nun who was charged with treasonable language. Freedom came slowly, and such was the effect of the supervision of the press that under the Restoration the newspaper press was practically reduced to the *London Gazette*—an official and inspired organ. In two centuries and a half such interferences have been abolished. While Great Britain has, after its fashion, never rested the freedom of the press on law but on its unwritten constitution, the United States have gloried in its recognition in their bills of right, an essential part of their constitutions. The price paid is a confusion of tongues, a multiplicity of opinion which produces indigestion, and an absence of standards which permits the glorification of the seamy and the sordid as freely as of the great and the admirable. Laudation of self and institutions is justified by accomplishment, and if it is pitched in too high a key is excusable by its honesty.

One compensation may be found in this discordant circle of self-praise, filial praise, and disciple praise. The note is unharmonious even in development. There has not long existed a studied

combination singing praises of one man or one policy; at no time do we trace that blind sacrifice of opinion which marks the devoted adherent to faction, to party, to Church or to State. There has been no suggestion of general interference by the state to impose upon the people a single interpretation of policy outside of law. The opposition has been as free as the supporters of government, and the third or independent party, or the silent independent voter, tends to correct such an overwhelming drift as could be interpreted as an unrestricted mandate from the people to their representatives, or from the government to the people. Except in great crises the American conception of liberty of speech has been maintained, and in the severe crises, as Rhodes says of the War of Secession, the great principles of liberty have not been invalidated by the exercise of extraordinary powers, although the arbitrary exercise of those powers was to be condemned. Even against the government the citizen can invoke the protection of the courts.

Self-editing finds expression in autobiography, and the one great example of American autobiography is that of Franklin, written, be it remembered, late in life, and never finished. Unable to live his life over again in fact, he took the nearest to it, to make a recollection of that life as durable as possible by putting it down in writing. And he gratified his vanity in so doing, believing that vanity is "often productive of good to the possessor, and to others that are within his sphere of action; and therefore, in many cases, it would not be altogether absurd if a man were to thank God for his vanity among the other comforts of life". The entire relation is redolent of a studied frankness that lulls the reader into a forgetfulness of much in Franklin's career that a moralist would dwell upon. I almost fancy that Cotton Mather would have been pleased to preach the last sermon heard by the condemned Benjamin Franklin. And the circumstance would have been possible, for Franklin was born in 1706 and Mather lived until 1728. The autobiography was first published in 1817, and could occasion no serious controversy; but the papers printed with the autobiography by the grandson did arouse comment on both sides of the ocean, more for what had been omitted than for what had been included. The question of an interference by the British government is not one which need delay us in passing. That government and that people have not shown strong inclinations to edit their expressions on America and its history, least of all at the time the Franklin volumes appeared. Jefferson intimated that William Temple Franklin may have been "an accomplice in the parricide of the memory of his immortal

grandfather", but the result of the publication gave proof of the incapacity of the grandson. There is not a line of Franklin's writings which could not have seen the light in 1817 with as little injury to his reputation as in 1917.

An earlier and the earliest printed autobiography after the War for Independence appeared in 1798. Major-General William Heath took us into his confidence in the form of a journal of events compiled after his active service was past, and published, it has been charged, before its intended time, to promote an election to office. Fully acquainted by his studies, as he believed, "with the theory of war in all its branches and duties, from the private soldier to the Commander in Chief", he wrote sometimes as a private and sometimes as generalissimo. He was the preacher of preparedness from 1770, and like most such preachers was lacking in action. A trusted lieutenant, he attained rank without distinction, and grew corpulent in inaction and performance. "Our General", as he pleases to call himself, a term reported to have been applied to him by Bernard in one of his prophetic moments, printed his book, which was greeted by smiles on all sides. It was impossible to misinterpret such a delightful piece of vanity. Its historical value shrinks before its personal quality.

Gradually an interest in personal history was awakened. In biography Marshall's *Life of Washington* was easily first to challenge attention. It was based upon original documents; it appeared at a time when the power of the Federalists had been shattered, and their shrewdest opponent was in full possession of the executive. Did Marshall intend to raise a monument to Washington or to the Federalist Party? It was good history, good politics, and good biography for the time, yet the neglect into which it has fallen is due more to the writer than to what he used of the subject. Fourteen years later, in 1818, Wirt's *Life of Patrick Henry*, necessarily largely based on tradition, carried into biography the oratorical flowers of Independence Day, and succeeded so far as to make its transplanted garden a desert place in comparison to a later and saner cultivation. It is something to have manufactured a good book, yet an example that is to be avoided—otherwise the sense of relation would be weakened. Virginia still held the field for a period. In 1825 the life and correspondence of Richard Henry Lee and in 1829 that of Arthur Lee were given out by a grandson of the former. They were defensive, colored by deliberate but mistaken purpose. Both compilations showed how good material could be wasted in an effort to prepare a brief in a cause of secondary importance.

The first compilation of Jefferson's letters, by his grandson Thomas Jefferson Randolph, appeared in 1830. Monroe and Madison, the closest intimates to Jefferson after his presidency, were still living, not to mention some of the opposition whose feelings might be touched. They knew some years in advance that this work was in preparation, yet neither attempted to interfere or to control what should be inserted. Randolph possessed the courage of his necessities, for on the last pages of the last volume he printed the *Anas*, that body of comment which is so characteristic of the Jefferson epos. Yet he did not let stand the criticism of Washington or the word which made John Marshall the mountebank of the X. Y. Z. mission, and he omitted more than half of the record as of lesser importance. Jefferson's opinions invited dissension, and the publication of the volumes led to an exchange of epithets that enlivened, even if it did not much enlighten, the history and practice of politics. Having gone as far as he did, Randolph need have omitted no part of the record. Those who disliked Jefferson were convinced of the soundness of their dislike; those who practised politics as a profession busily engaged themselves in constructing that Jeffersonian myth which still persists and, judiciously used, has exerted a constant effect in hypnotizing the wavering voter.

These lights of the War for Independence used language unrestrained by a fear of publication. They lived in the day of a newspaper which seems singularly harmless for attack. The party scribblers of low character might dip their pens in venom; the very excess of their invective discounted and the small circulation deadened its force. When Callender turned upon Jefferson, his benefactor, he was obliged to set up a sheet of his own, and the few copies in existence are eloquent on his poverty and incapacity. In the respectable press the discussion of men and measures rarely rose above mediocrity, and mere personalities could not explain policies. Hamilton, one of the best controversialists of his time, might have repeated his letter to John Adams six times over, with six different objects, and had either the Diary or letters of John Adams seen the light in his day, the pot of discord would have remained at boiling point. Both men in their own time experienced the effect of an untoward publication of confidential communications, and the experience embittered their later years. Hamilton's papers drifted for years looking for a biographer, and when at last in 1840 they were used by a son, his brothers openly expressed their disapprobation and regret on the event.

In this early period of personal relations the editor had no

place. The member of the family sufficed. However marked a curiosity over a public character might exist, it did not extend to his writings. An early experiment (1810) of printing Hamilton's financial papers failed. With the current questions interest ceased, and newspaper discussion rarely dipped into past American history. Precedents and comparisons were drawn from Greece and Rome, not from colonial Britain. In the small number of instances where elaborate defense was deemed proper, it was the leading actor who performed the task—as in Monroe's defense of his French mission and in Edmund Randolph's *Vindication*. A pamphlet would cover the emergency; and it was prepared by an interested party. Yet in the first years the editor appears in a modest but efficient form, dealing with original sources and with some comprehension of the function he was to fulfil.

The earliest example is Ebenezer Hazard and his *Historical Collections*, printed by the author—a euphemism then as now for printed at a loss—in 1792. Wait's *State Papers* (1815) were a forerunner of Force's *Archives*. As to the publication in 1819 of the *Acts and Proceedings of the Convention of 1787* by John Quincy Adams, then secretary of state, as related in his *Memoirs*, he enlists the heartfelt sympathy of everyone who has dealt with original material as arranged by ambitious but badly equipped adventurers in history, or by pious hands directed by filial apprehension. These early essays in printing sources were guided by the proper spirit. Without undue reverence for the written word, they followed the text without modification in language or in intention. Why should this attitude have undergone a change which for half a century persisted in mutilating the text and giving excuse for every vagary of statement?

'Tis woman that seduces all mankind;
By her we first were taught the wheedling arts.

And it was a Massachusetts woman who pointed out the way. Secretly Eliza Susan Quincy compiled a memoir of her grandfather Josiah Quincy, the patriot, and when she had completed the task, she induced her father, Josiah Quincy, to put his name on the title-page and thus assume responsibility for the dark deed. How she doctored the text, altering, omitting, and mutilating as seemed to her proper and best, has only recently become known. I will not say that she violated all the commandments of good editing, but she was remarkably successful in sinning against the great majority. This volume appeared in 1825, and the first volume of Sparks's *Washington* followed nine years later, so perfect an imitation of all

the faults embodied in the Quincy publication, that collusion might be assumed, without the excuse of family reticence.

I wish to be just to Mr. Sparks. Admit that he designed and carried into execution large undertakings, and a series of ten volumes is a large undertaking even now; admit his singleness of purpose and consistency of operation; is it harsh to say that his judgment is condemned by the necessity for going again over the ground he covered, not because of new material discovered or available since his day, but because of an unreliable text? The writings of Washington, Franklin, and Gouverneur Morris and the *Diplomatic Correspondence* which he edited—all have since been republished, and with patience, not from a few samples but from the many, may be discovered the manner in which Sparks misused his opportunity. His good fortune in being a pioneer in this form of compilation, and his industry as an editor, have placed his volumes on the shelves of every self-respecting library, public and private; yet his repute as an authority has been steadily falling.

Deliberate falsification can hardly be charged to these early practitioners in editing. They felt the presence of some who had participated in the events they were to describe. Why print anything unpleasant, or unkind, or partizan, or personal? Why expose the foibles of men looming big as historical characters? These contemporaries, wearied by perpetual party strife, were beyond a capacity to reply; they asked only to be permitted to close their lives in peace. Others were actually in office, honored by the free choice of the electors or by the trust of those who held their office by election. Why raise disputes of the past, much and probably ignorantly discussed at the time, now the ashes of controversy? The supposed necessity of party supplied the newspapers with abuse of individuals, and the pamphlets of the day could match the newspapers in directness and scurrility of language. History and biography should rise to a higher level, and in style attain to some merit. If it bordered on the ultra-patriotic, that was an excusable weakness, for the men of the War of Independence then looked large, larger even than the principles for which they fought.

The influence of official relations must be held responsible for some serious blunders. When Congress assisted to publish Hamilton's works in 1850, it was the son who edited the material; the Jefferson, three years later, was entrusted to the librarian of the Department of State, and he took remarkable liberties with the text—inexcusable, unless we accept the theory that political exigency rather than historical truth guided the undertaking. The dominance

of the South made expedient suppression of some features, for the South had become sensitive to the growing antagonism to slavery and the increase in material power at the North. Even the foreign relations of the United States remained in good part unknown; the executive could give out what it pleased and withhold information on the plea of prejudice to public interests. The Department of State harbors an unmeasured mass of historical material, and has used only what has seemed good to more or less well-informed officials in the past when weighing it in the scale of occasion. Diplomacy, even the open diplomacy of the United States, has had its high victims, and both secretaries of state and agents stand as sacrifices offered to smooth over blunders or to quiet public clamor. What a field for judicious editing!

It may thus be said that the editor has been coming into his own, not rising in importance, but better recognized as a useful albeit somewhat erratic adjunct to the writing of history. The quality of product has improved, and the shadows of family or political doubt are less frequently encountered. Public archives have been made accessible, a generous freedom of use accorded by private owners of papers; and pride of ancestry has contributed its share to the ever increasing quantity of product. If only certain possessors of material could appreciate how far they are like the ostrich, and what damage their aloofness is working on their pet admirations! Imagine trying to prove anything against public morals on John Jay! Yet he has been fastened in a niche of the 1833 model, when reserve darkened reputations. I could name a number of such distorted models, still cramped under a silence that almost confesses guilt. Where papers have been destroyed in the hope that criticism would be ended, the ghosts of old controversies arise and the worst or opposition phases of character are remembered. Descendants who have nestled in self-confidence and wrapped themselves in forgetfulness are pained and shocked to have the old gossip and tradition of their ancestors served up highly spiced in modern journalese. They have only themselves to blame.

For nearly a century after the Declaration of Independence both biography and editing of original materials had not attained success. They lisped, fearful of speaking aloud, and they avoided crucial matters of controversy. Was it this example which led to a series of political autobiographies in the last two generations? From Benjamin F. Butler to George F. Hoar and beyond—the mere writing of the names suggests startling comparisons of product. Was it a suspicion that they could not entrust their reputa-

tions to editors or to biographers which tempted them into a difficult adventure? Was it a desire to anticipate the opinion of contemporaries, and while yet living to taste the sweets of servile flattery? They chatter of many things, but are reticent on those most important to the historian. As appeals to a simple faith, and as childlike murmurings of unrelated facts they awaken wonder without gratifying a reasonable curiosity. To compile such works and then to destroy the original records, as if the last word had been said, is a crime against history, and an unavailing plea in abatement against further consideration. Yet most of those self-constituted apologists have been lawyers, and some of them good lawyers.

To approach such modern instances with due reverence is difficult. Conditions have altered, the standard of greatness has changed, and the demands as well as the responsibilities of biographer and editor are other than were accepted unquestioned a half-century ago. History is better written, and the subject is attracting the best; but autobiography lags behind, good-naturedly accepted for its defects rather than for its virtues. The charm of literary autobiography persists, but the unreliability of political autobiography has come to be a byword. To describe action directly and intention truthfully after the event appears to demand opposite qualities. *Magna pars fui*—the accent is on the *magna*, and the relator exaggerates his own importance while twisting his facts and misstating his motives.

Is it not a form of conceit, and a vulgar form at that, to suppose that the story of a life can be only self-written? Is man so little influenced by circumstances and so greatly moulded by his own will that he can consciously assume to be master of his own fortunes? The self-made man is subject to attacks of assurance which awaken in him an anxiety to tell others how he accomplished it—it referring to any achievement from making a large fortune to writing a popular song. Success is the worst judge of itself, and some other tribunal should take cognizance and, if possible, commit such budding sprouts to safe quarters where they may interchange their confidences without making an undue exhibition of themselves. The thing is possible, for did not an Italian saint not only overcome the Devil but make him confess *all* his sins?

The human machine is self-advertising, for its wants are imperative and its acts come for judgment before an immediate tribunal—public opinion. Is not, then, the desire to write autobiography a confession that some explanation of conduct is to say the least expedient? The atmosphere of publicity in which a public character

of to-day moves gives to surrounding objects and relations a certain distortion. The distortion becomes natural to him, and he wonders why others do not accept him as unquestioningly as formerly, why they adopt a critical attitude with a tendency to open opposition. If he is pushed out from a public career, and gains time for reflection and self-examination, the injustice and unreason of his former constituency appear large and to him are based upon misconception. So he enters upon his defense, and tells the old story in the old way, with distorted vision and with vanished glamour. It requires a greatness of character to stand the test, and there are few great characters. The majority babble, retail half-truths and vamp the worn and patched shreds until they have encased themselves in nothing but their own too transparent self-consciousness, still not undisturbed by doubts. Seeking to invest themselves with a cloudlike splendor and halo as the reward for upright conduct, they retire into the smoke-shield of their own creation, to emerge streaked with smudge. As a mode of defense autobiography is a failure; it too often confirms the old saying, that a man who is his own lawyer has a fool for a client. The ghastly skull of St. Charles Borromeo looked out from its gorgeous trappings and surroundings, always a reminder of what he had been—a mortal. As ghastly figures stare from the written pages of autobiography, reminders that the mortal or weak parts dominated the whole, and left a record that is unchangeable.

To the biographer, not too closely related to his subject, and to the editor, belongs the task of telling the truth—not the simple or the whole truth, but as much as the records will afford. The writer of biography has the wider field, the better opportunity, for he may wander far and invoke the dramatic and the picturesque, even infusing into the relation a color of his own. His story may read like a romance, it may be a fairy tale, or it may be a verbal cenotaph wherein nothing of its subject may be found; it soon is weighed, judged, and ticketed for remembrance or oblivion.

An editor is restricted to the written record; the memories of oldest inhabitants and the tradition of generations have no attraction for him. His purpose is to give all that may be of service to our host of anxious inquirers and the ever-increasing number of writers of history, and to give it unvarnished, as the documents contain it. This is not to say that he will be unsympathetic. I defy anyone to live among the records of the past without absorbing some spirit kindred to that which actuated the men of that time. He sees through their eyes, and re-enacts their deeds, with a wider

vision and a knowledge of consequences not vouchsafed to them. Whatever reserve is imposed arises out of a sense of decency; all else may safely be left to the judgment of history. It is good to humanize Washington, to have the means of tracing the tortuous policy of Jefferson, to measure the ability and ambitions of Hamilton, to comprehend the rash but honest conduct of the Adamses, and to wonder at the little greatness of Monroe. We owe these to modern editors, and in no instance did they inflict injury upon good repute, nor did they greatly modify the great lines of historical writing. They supplied treasuries of fact from which incidents and characters may be written or newly written. To furnish the material in its full and unaltered shape—that is the achievement of the change which has come to editorial methods in a generation.

True perspective requires time and space, and neither historian nor editor can use material of the day in the hope of attaining finality. Yet both are in possession of a trained quality of which few journalists, few civil and military officials can boast. A knowledge of what has gone before, of past events, a habit of analyzing character, of combining facts and weighing evidence, constitute an added sense in seeking some solid foundation in the welter of to-day. They have tested the politicians' position. They know that from the very beginning of its history the country has been in a chronic state of crisis, requiring the election of this or that man to office, demanding sacrifices which constitute the stock claim of the politician to reward; that the years are strewn with such sacrifices, and that the number of pretended and willing saviors of the country would fill several Valhallas. They know that family, censors, and state are unavailing against time, and that no cause has been without its evil features which cannot be suppressed and ought not to be forgotten. They know that no human agency can belie the character for which the man himself is responsible. The inevitableness of history lies before them in too many examples to be neglected. The editor deals with individuals, the historian with generals. The cultivation of a balanced and non-partizan spirit and utterance, no small accomplishment, brings its reward in confidence and clarity of vision.

What is the application of this excursion? For three years the country has been under a stress which has tested its people and its government. In the mass of interested discussion and propaganda, licit and illicit, it has been difficult not to take a position and express the faith that is in us. Even before actual participation in the war necessary information was wanting. Of partial statements the number was and is in excess, but it may be doubted if the fullest

exposure of motives and performance will much change general opinion. The extremist is beyond change, and among these extremists on both sides are some historians. Their honesty of conviction is not to be questioned, but their violence of expression is to be regretted. Exaggeration in language is not confined to the newspaper. The time is not yet come for a final weighing of evidence, for we are living, as in the England of the Restoration, under a "Royal Gazette". Cables and mails are under a censorship which tends to become more rigid; discussion of governmental policy and execution is under a threatened interference by officials, who are wanting in experience and are fallible and extremely sensitive to currents of public opinion; and American opinion is subject to excitements, fitful and destructive of reputations. But unless a man sells his soul he can be heard and answered, or left to the certainties of time. It is all very well to speak of the sober second thought of the people; the first thought may not be sober and may inflict great injury, and in war times the first thought is explosive. How long has it been since our writers of text-books on history consented to modify their denunciation of Great Britain? How many years have allowed the war with Mexico to pose as a shocking example of greed and broken faith? The word rebel as applied to the South is a survival; the bitterness has slowly turned into sweetness, and the glory of honorable conflict is shared between the two sections. Much of what parades as history to-day will fortunately sink into the forgetfulness of the future, to be exhumed at times as curious examples of misdirected energy and ill-exercised thought. What remains, clarified of its partizanship, may serve for real history. It will be two generations before the full publication of documents can begin, and then will be applied the tests of fair judgment—the real editing. In the meanwhile we should cultivate, as far as possible, the editorial attitude, keeping our minds open, restraining our criticism lest it lead to injustice and persecution, avoiding personalities, and exercising the same patience and restraint under wrongs and violations of good faith as have placed our country with an unsoiled record at the front of a world movement.

WORTHINGTON CHAUNCEY FORD.

AMERICAN RULE IN MEXICO

DURING the war of 1846-1848 portions of Mexico, conquered by our arms, remained for shorter or longer periods in American hands. Matamoros was captured by General Taylor in May, 1846; our flag went up in California two months later; New Mexico yielded to Kearny in August; Monterey, Saltillo, and Tampico fell during the autumn; Vera Cruz surrendered in March, 1847, Puebla in May, and the capital in September; and our troops did not evacuate the country until the middle of 1848. American rule was therefore sufficiently extensive and sufficiently prolonged to exhibit its character, and few aspects of the war are more interesting than our manner of bearing sway.

The initial spirit of the American Executive toward the Mexicans may justly be described as fraternal. Polk's intention was to treat non-combatants as friends, and protect them in all their rights of person, property, and creed. Both for immediate military success and for the eventual restoration of satisfactory intercourse, diplomatic and commercial, it seemed highly desirable to attack only the government of Mexico and the troops under its control, and to avoid rousing the great body of the nation. Accordingly, Taylor was promptly supplied with a proclamation, to be given wide currency, which attributed to the revolutionist Paredes—now in supreme authority—all the blame for the conflict, assured the Mexican public that a government of "usurpers and tyrants" had involved them in its losses and miseries, and promised that no one behaving peaceably should be molested. The general was instructed that his "utmost endeavors" must be exerted to make good this pledge. An active policy of conciliation was urged upon him; and our government went so far as to place Roman Catholic priests at the front in order to prove that no hostile designs were entertained against the religion of the Mexicans.¹

Later events hardened this fraternal disposition. Owing to the stubbornness of the enemy, unlooked-for expenses and loss of life occurred; and Polk's efforts to negotiate, besides proving fruitless

¹ *American Flag*, Matamoros, July 14, 1846; *House Ex. Doc. No. 60*, 30 Cong., 1 sess., pp. 155, 165-166, 284; W. L. Marcy to John McElroy, May 19, 1846, Adj.-Gen.'s office; J. K. Polk, *Diary* (1910), I. 408-410; *W. W. S. Bliss [i. e., Z. Taylor] to M. B. Lamar, October 15, 1846, Lamar Papers, Texas State Library. (An asterisk indicates manuscript material.)

for a long while, met with exasperating rebuffs. In reply to an American overture Rejón, the minister of relations, intimated in August, 1846, that our government wished to ignore the causes of the war because we dared not face the question of its justice. Six months later a messenger from our State Department was handled unceremoniously, as with tongs; and he brought back, in a quite offensively worded note, the refusal of Mexico to treat unless our forces should first withdraw from her soil and her waters. Naturally Polk was displeased. Instead of wishing longer to conciliate, he felt disposed to bring the stern realities of war home to the Mexicans, and in fact concluded that such a change of policy would be essential. In particular he decided that our custom of paying liberally for whatever was used by our armies, and thus providing the inhabitants with a profitable market, should give way to a system of levying "contributions" and seizing supplies; and corresponding intimations were despatched to the commanding generals. This method was harsh, but still it was only the legitimate harshness of war. It is no part of an invader's duty to scatter gold over conquered territory, and our government did not propose to go a step beyond the acknowledged rights of belligerency. Vattel, the standard authority on international law, said,

A nation [at war] on every opportunity lays its hands on the enemy's goods, appropriates them to itself, and thereby, besides weakening the adversary, strengthens itself, and, at least in part, procures an indemnification, an equivalent, either for the very cause of the war, or for the expenses and losses resulting from it.²

The real field of investigation, however, is not Washington but Mexico. The true question is, what things were actually done by the Americans there; and these may for convenience be grouped in four classes, which can readily be distinguished even if not practically to be severed: first, the direct relations of our commanding officers to the people; secondly, their relations through Mexican officials; thirdly, their relations through the behavior of their troops; and finally their relations to the Mexican civil administration.

² M. C. Rejón to J. Buchanan, August 31, 1846, *Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 1*, 29 Cong., 2 sess., p. 43; A. J. Atocha to Buchanan, July 3, 1847, Buchanan Papers, Penn. Hist. Society; *Consul J. Black, February, 24, 1847, State Dept.; *Don Simplicio*, February 17, 1847; *La Época*, February 23, 1847; *Bermúdez de Castro to Spanish government, no. 444, res., March 1, 1847, Archivo Particular del Minist. de Estado, Madrid; *Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 1*, 30 Cong., 1 sess., p. 37; Polk, *Diary*, II. 145, 432; Polk to House of Representatives, January 2, 1849, *House Ex. Doc. No. 20*, 30 Cong., 2 sess. (Intimations) *House Ex. Doc. No. 60*, 30 Cong., 1 sess., pp. 341, 1005; *Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 14*, 30 Cong., 1 sess., p. 5. E. de Vattel, *Droit des Gens*, book III., ch. 9, sect. 161.

Naturally the evidence on these points is not absolutely complete. Things were neither done nor recorded in a very systematic style. Owing to later disturbances in Mexico, not a few papers have been lost or destroyed; and the existing data are widely scattered. But the reports of American and Mexican officers, the despatches of foreign diplomatic and consular agents, local archives, newspapers, diaries, and private correspondence provide a great mass of information, which in the sum and in general is quite convincing. In these pages, of course, only the most representative documents can be cited.

The fundamental direct relation of American commanders to the people arose from insistence that civilians must abstain from hostilities, since to enforce this rule the standard international system of threats and, when it seemed necessary, harsh and summary action was unhesitatingly employed. Scott may fairly be described as conscientious and humane. He said once to a confidential associate, that if he could gain a victory in one way with a loss of eight hundred men and in a more brilliant manner with a loss of nine hundred, he would regard himself as a murderer, should he choose the second alternative; and his feelings toward the Mexicans were similar in quality. Indeed a book written by a Mexican in 1850 credited him with "humanity on all occasions". Yet in a most kindly worded proclamation, which he regarded as the crowning act of conciliation, this language was employed:

The system of forming guerrilla parties to annoy us will, I assure you, produce only evils to this country, and none to our army, which knows how to protect itself, and how to proceed against such cut-throats; and if, so far from calming resentments and passions, you try to irritate [them], you will but force upon us the hard necessity of retaliation.³

Citizens who took up arms now and then, and waged partizan warfare, received accordingly the treatment of outlaws. They were hunted and harried; and in general this policy extended to all who abetted their operations in any way, or were reasonably suspected of doing so. Houses and villages believed to be their rendezvous disappeared in smoke, and the women and children dwelling there found such refuge as they could. Troops selected because they were known to be merciless as well as indefatigable and brave scoured particular districts; and, aside from towns of considerable

³ (Murderer) *N. P. Trist, no. 11, August 14, 1847, State Department. (Book) Hitchcock in *The Republic*, February 15, 1851. (Act of conciliation) W. Scott, *Memoirs*, II. 549. (Proclamation) *House Ex. Doc. No. 60*, 30 Cong., 1 sess., p. 971.

size, the routes from the Rio Grande to Monterey and from Vera Cruz to Mexico came to be little more than black swaths of desolation. The principle was established that citizens residing near the scene of guerrilla outrages were to suffer. Taylor imposed a crushing fine in one such case; and at Jalapa it was ordered that three hundred dollars must be paid for every murder, or the value of the property in each case of brigandage.⁴

People who attempted to assail our troops in the towns not only fared badly themselves but brought down misfortunes upon their neighbors. The military commander at Puebla, on finding that the governor of the state was endeavoring to cause an uprising, promptly notified the prefect that in the case of a hostile disturbance "the City [that is to say, innocent and guilty alike] would probably suffer from my guns and mortars". At the capital such an experience actually occurred. Soon after the Americans entered it, Mexicans fired upon them from the houses. Before long the First Alcalde issued this warning: "The General-in-Chief [Scott] of the American forces which have occupied the city this morning has informed the Ayuntamiento [city council] that if within three hours, reckoned from the time this notice is posted, there is not a complete cessation of the acts of hostility now being committed . . . , he will proceed with all rigor against the guilty, permitting their goods and property to be sacked and razing the block [*manzana*] in which are situated the houses from which the American troops are fired upon." At the same time the city council issued a placard requesting the people to remain peaceably at home, and saying in explanation that under Scott's orders every dwelling from which a bullet should be fired would be destroyed with artillery, and all within it put to death. These warnings were not effectual, however; and General

⁴The documents relating to the guerrillas are many hundreds in number and mostly in manuscript, but the following may be cited. Córdoba (Mex.) archives; *House Ex. Doc. No. 1*, 30 Cong., 2 sess., p. 75 (Marcy); *Flag of Freedom* (Puebla), vol. I., no. 4; M. Rivera, *Hist. de Jalapa*, III. 902; Lerdo de Tejada, *Apuntes Hist. de . . . Vera-Cruz* (1850-1858), II. 582; *Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 32*, 31 Cong., 1 sess., p. 43 (Hughes); *G. H. Hughes to Wilson, September 13, 1847, Adj.-Gen.'s office; *J. E. Wool to Hamtramck, December 18, 1847, *ibid.*; *Apuntes para la Historia de la Guerra* (1848), p. 387; *Pattridge to Miss Watterston, July 21, 1847, Watterston Papers, Library of Congress. Some of the desolation, particularly in the north, was due to camp-followers who banded together for the purpose of plundering, to deserters, and to discharged soldiers on the way home. H. J. Moore, *Scott's Campaigns* (1849), p. 72; *House Ex. Doc. No. 60*, 30 Cong., 1 sess., pp. 1006, 1037 (Marcy); *Scott, Gen. Orders 372, December 12, 1847, Adj.-Gen.'s office; *Niles' Register*, May 8, 1847, p. 152; *D. H. Hastings, Diary. (Near the scene) *House Ex. Doc. No. 60*, 30 Cong., 1 sess., p. 1142 (Taylor); E. del C. Negrete, *Invasión de los Norte-Americanos* (1890-1891), vol. III., app., p. 60.

Worth wrote to his daughter, "I caused the heavy guns to be turned against every house [from which a shot came] . . . and after a few hours of such appliance, not regarding where or who it hit, quelled the dastardly villains". Yet no complaint could be made. Vattel laid down the principle that people could not hope to be spared by a successful invader, unless willing to be submissive and to "refrain from all hostilities"; and Europeans on the ground felt that under the circumstances notable moderation was displayed by our generals.⁵

Commanders also required Mexicans to obey what may be called the martial police regulations. These were simple and sane. The most important was that no liquor should be furnished the troops, and the other chief rules had reference to good order and proper conduct. Naturally enough, the regulations failed not infrequently to produce all the intended results, but the American officers appear in general to have been decidedly earnest. At Saltillo, since orders did not prevent liquor-selling, Worth imposed a penalty of fifty lashes. Gambling-places received careful attention, and in many instances were closed or restricted. Suspicious characters, particularly men who had served as officers in the Mexican army, were notified to give an account of themselves. Persons without visible means of support, including American camp-followers, had to go forth; but families—whose presence made them in a sense hostages, tended to promote stability, and widened the basis of taxation—did not always find it easy to leave town. Carrying concealed weapons without permission had to be given up. Early hours for going home at night were occasionally fixed. Placards could not be freely posted up. "Tyrannical caprice", exclaimed some of the Mexicans; but they had no real grounds for complaint—especially since equally stringent regulations defended their lives, property, and comfort, and the same autocratic power provided work or free rations for the people whenever the need arose.⁶

⁵ *T. Childs to Prefect, August 12, 1847, Adj.-Gen.'s office. (Mexico) *Apuntes para la Hist.*, pp. 325-329; *Veramendi, Proclam., September 14, 1847, Ayunt. archives, Mex.; Ayuntamiento placard, Yale College Library; *Worth to daughter, September 28, 1847, Worth Papers (in private hands). (Moderation) *Chargé Doyle to Foreign Office, No. 1, January 13, 1848, Public Record Office, London; New Orleans *Picayune*, October 14, 1847 (letter from a Frenchman). Vattel, *op. cit.*, book III., ch. 8, sect. 147.

⁶ *Monitor Republicano*, Mexico, March 29, 1847; G. T. M. Davis, *Autobiography* (1891), p. 246; G. G. Meade, *Letters* (1913), I. 147; T. Wilhelm, *Hist. of Eighth U. S. Infantry*, I. 299; *W. J. Worth, Order, November 19, 1846, War Dept. archives, Mexico; **id.* to Gefé Político, Saltillo; November 23, *ibid.*; **id.* to Puebla Ayunt., May 18, 1847, Ayunt. archives; *id.* to First Alcalde, Puebla, May 21, 1847, *ibid.*; *Col. G. H. Hughes, Jalapa, series of

Under our second head, Mexican officials were frequently requested to furnish laborers and supplies; and it was not unusual to add in such instances that in case of non-compliance the Americans would help themselves to what they needed, and pay nothing. This threat, however, sounded more terrible than it was. "There must be the *semblance of coercion*", Worth wrote on one such occasion. The people were usually glad, or at least willing, to exchange produce and services for round, yellow dollars; and it was obviously for the common advantage that a person in authority, well acquainted with his constituents and the local conditions, should arrange the exchanges; but any appearance of having friendly business relations with the invader seemed likely to bring down punishment from Mexican sources at a later day, and therefore was guarded against. Transactions of this kind proceeded usually with little real friction, save when the excessive prices, that were often demanded, had to be reduced arbitrarily.⁷

Certain other relations between American commanders and Mexican officials proved less agreeable to the latter. So long as active hostilities continued, both Taylor and Scott were unwilling to seize instead of purchasing supplies, as the Executive recommended. They knew that our gold in a Mexican pocket diffused a soporific influence among the nerves of his patriotism; that stocks would be concealed or even destroyed by the owners rather than

orders, Adj.-Gen.'s office; *Col. W. Gates, Tampico, series of orders, *ibid.*; *Gen. Worth, Monterey and Saltillo, series of orders, *ibid.*; *Gen. Wool, Monterey and Saltillo, series of orders, *ibid.*; *Col. H. Wilson, Vera Cruz, series of orders, *ibid.*; *Gen. J. Shields, Tampico, series of orders, *ibid.* (Rations, work) *Consul F. L. Giffard, no. 12, Vera Cruz, April 13, 1847, P. R. O. The following body of regulations for Saltillo, established by Wool on July 9, 1847, is fairly typical: All residents capable of working must have some honest vocation, and those found here after three days without such will be tried and punished. Those who arrive must report to the governor; and those who depart, except U. S. officers, must do the same. All crimes will be punished by Mexican laws when Mexicans alone are concerned; when men of different nationalities are implicated, they may be tried by the governor or by tribunals appointed by him. A tariff of prices will be published in orders from time to time. Gambling is prohibited. Liquors may be sold only in licensed houses, and none may be imported. Unauthorized public fandangos [dances] and exhibitions are prohibited. Mexican houses may not be taken for private uses without the consent of the owners. The firing of arms is forbidden. All disorder will be punished.

⁷ *Worth to Vice-Gov., Saltillo, November 28, 1846, War Dept. archives, Mex.; *id.* to First Alcalde, Puebla, May 17, 1847, Ayunt. archives; *Gefe Político to Ayunt., Saltillo, November 30, 1846, Salt. archives. R. Patterson to Castro, November 9, 1847, N. Orl. *Picayune*, December 19, 1847; *Worth to Commrs., Saltillo, November 23, 1846, Adj.-Gen.'s office; *House Ex. Doc. No. 60*, 30 Cong., 1 sess., p. 967 (Worth, May 19).

given up to force; and that without local supplies it would hardly be feasible to conduct active operations. But when serious hostilities appeared to be nearly or quite over, Polk insisted upon taxing the Mexicans. Scott himself concurred then in the policy, and besides imposing a contribution of \$150,000 upon the city of Mexico, he ordered in December, 1847, that whenever in possession of the chief point or points in any state, the American army should collect for its own use all the taxes previously paid to the Mexican government. The taxes were paid grudgingly, of course; and when Wool, now commanding at the north, required the local authorities to track down and arrest the guerrillas, they felt that their cup was full; but the results were tranquillity and an expense no greater than before the Americans had arrived—indeed less, for the personal extortions of Mexican officers no longer had to be endured. For a number of reasons, however, the plan to impose taxes did not go thoroughly into effect. Time was necessary to ascertain the conditions in Mexico and lay wise plans. Communication between Washington and the front required further time. The danger of inflicting hardships on Mexicans who had shown themselves friendly had to be recognized and met; and the importance of obtaining a treaty of peace and evacuating the country made it highly desirable to avoid exasperating the nation in general.⁸

As for the behavior of American soldiers toward the people, our government, the commanding generals, nearly all the regular officers, and most of the volunteer officers wished that it should be fair and kind. Not only justice and civilization, but policy, dictated that course. As at first no legal provision for punishing American soldiers outside our territory existed, Scott, the commander-in-chief of the army, drew up and submitted to the administration a martial-law order to be enforced in Mexico until Congress could legislate on the subject. Probably for political reasons, the government would not at that date accept it; and when Scott suggested the plan to Taylor, the latter tossed it aside as "another of Scott's lessons". Taylor

⁸ *House Ex. Doc. No. 60*, 30 Cong., 1 sess., p. 354 (Taylor); Scott, *Memoirs*, II. 582; *Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 14*, 30 Cong., 1 sess., p. 6 (Scott); Polk, *Diary*, III. 156, 185; *J. Y. Mason to Scott, September 1, 1847, Adj.-Gen.'s office; *Scott, Gen. Orders 287, 376, *ibid.*; *Wool, series of orders and reports, *ibid.*; *e. g.*, the use of buildings was no longer to be paid for except in special cases (*Scott, Gen. Orders 358; *Hughes to Scott, January 5, 1848, Adj.-Gen.'s office); *I. McDowell to Webb, April 15, 1848, *ibid.*; Scott, Gen. Orders 395, December 31, 1847, laid an annual assessment upon each state. Akin to the contributions, because imposed by virtue of military authority, was the moderate tariff prescribed for Mexican ports held by us (*Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 1*, 30 Cong., 1 sess., pp. 552-588).

was a born fighter and born leader of men, but lacked education and wide experience. Accustomed to a narrow sphere, he relied upon personal influence, which proved ennobling so far as it went, but came far short of the need. Besides, he had been mentioned prominently after his victories on the Rio Grande as a likely candidate for the presidency, and perhaps did not wish to make himself unpopular. Anyhow, the truth was that under his direct command Matamoros and, for a brief time after it was captured, Monterey became almost infernos. The regulars behaved well, but many of the volunteers, feeling absolved from every law of God or man save courage and fidelity to the stars and stripes, acted accordingly. "Crime followed in their footsteps", wrote a trustworthy officer with reference to these men, "and wherever they trod, they left indelible traces of infamy". Drunken, quarrelsome soldiers filled the streets of Matamoros at all hours. One drew a pistol on the British consul because he did not approve of the consul's walking-stick. Citizens were shot down merely for amusement. At Monterey, to say nothing of other outrages, it was estimated by an American officer that one hundred murders in cold blood occurred almost immediately.⁹

At Monterey, happily, Worth soon took charge; and his keen sense of propriety, clear mind, and unflinching courage promptly reduced chaos to something like order. Transferred later to Saltillo, he did equally well there, listening hour after hour to complainants and administering justice with untechnical but impartial ability; and he was followed by governors of a similar stamp. Person and property became safer than ever before and the town prospered. Tampico was a more difficult problem, for it had close communication with New Orleans by water; hard characters from the States could not wholly be excluded; and apparently every volunteer felt in duty bound to celebrate his arrival with a "frolic". But Gates and Shields knew quite well what needed to be done. Patrols marched up and down the wide streets; sentries with fixed bayonets could be found at every gathering, even balls; noisy houses

⁹ Scott, *Memoirs*, II. 393-394. The testimony as to the conduct of American volunteers at Matamoros and in the early days at Monterey is overwhelming. A few specimens only are given here. (Matamoros) *J. C. Henshaw Narrative, Mass. Hist. Soc.; Meade, *Letters*, I. 91, 108-109, 147; *C. Carroll to Faulac, August 9, 1846, War Dept. archives, Mexico; *Giffard to Bankhead, June 9, 1846, P. R. O., London; W. S. Henry, *Campaign Sketches* (1847), pp. 124, 137. (Monterey) T. B. Thorpe, *Our Army at Monterey* (1847), p. 120; *Registro Oficial de Durango*, October 15, 1846; *Henshaw Narrative, *supra*; *S. E. Chamberlain, *Diary*; *Gov. Morales to Taylor, September 29, and reply, Adj.-Gen.'s office; *Niles' Register*, November 14, 1846, p. 165, November 21, p. 180.

were soon closed; and the very happiest of frolics was pretty sure to end before morning in a nap on the guard-house floor. For the principal outrages that occurred in the north, it should be added, there was some excuse. Mexicans charged with offenses against our men were sometimes acquitted on trial, though morally convicted, because the evidence against them proved legally incomplete, or was rebutted by testimony almost certainly perjured. American soldiers could not easily witness a result of this kind without retaliating upon the person they believed guilty or upon others of his nationality; and it must even be admitted that probably such barbarous reprisals exerted a wholesome effect on the bad Mexicans.¹⁰

Scott, for his part, landing at Tampico on the way to open his campaign at Vera Cruz, issued an order that instantly threw the pale of martial law round the people by ordaining that soldiers committing atrocities punishable in the United States by a civil court, should be tried in Mexico by a military commission. This order was supplemented with a scheme of safeguards, which meant that one or more soldiers, bearing a suitable document signed by a corps or division general, could be quartered at any place which it was especially desirable to protect. In occupying towns the rule was to billet no officer or man, without consent, upon any inhabitant, and to quarter the troops in barracks and other public buildings used for the purpose by the Mexican government. These arrangements, the practice of paying for everything used by the army, the principle of treating non-combatant Mexicans as fellow-citizens, and a strenuous endeavor, through arguments and appeals, to enlist the co-operation of all the decent men of the army in the suppression of outrages, constituted the plan of Scott.¹¹

¹⁰ (Monterey) Meade, *Letters*, I. 147; *Worth, Orders, October 8, etc., Adj.-Gen.'s office; *González to Santa Anna, November 21, War Dept. archives, Mexico. (Saltillo) *Worth, Orders, Adj.-Gen.'s office; *Avalos, August 5, 1847, War Dept. archives, Mexico; *González to Worth, November 30, 1846, and reply, December 2, *ibid.*; *Worth to daughter, January 4, 1847, Worth Papers. (Tampico) E. A. Lawton [Robert Anderson], *Artillery Officer* (1911), pp. 16, 17, 37, 39, 46, etc.; *Gates and *Shields, Orders, Adj.-Gen.'s office.

¹¹ *Scott, Gen. Orders 20, February 19, 1847, Adj.-Gen.'s office; Scott, *Memoirs*, II. 547-548, 580. The safeguard given to the village of S. Martín read as follows (Adj.-Gen.'s office): "Office of the Civil and Military Governor, Puebla, 22nd January, 1848. Whereas the Municipality of the town of San Martín, on the main road to Mexico, has presented a Solicitation to this Government with regard to certain permissions and protection, this Safeguard is given to said Municipality in the following terms:—1., The authorities and inhabitants of San Martín, their families and private property are placed under the protection of the United States forces, as long as they remain quiet, neutral and peaceable and will therefore be left unmolested and not interfered with by the

The system had to be supplemented, however. By his own official estimate ninety-seven out of one hundred soldiers were honorable, but this left three per cent. of the other kind. Besides, volunteers looked upon the regulars as little higher in the scale of humanity than slaves, and, even when intending to do about the right thing, resented strict rule. "They are a set of Goths and Vandals", said George G. Meade. "The volunteers", recorded one of them in his diary, "will not be treated as regular soldiers, and no man need ever attempt to enforce such discipline". Even desertion seemed to many a legitimate way of escape from a degradation like that.

"Sergeant, buck him and gag him, our officers cry,
For each trifling offence which they happen to spy,
Till with bucking and gagging of Dick, Tom, Pat and Bill,
Faith, the Mexican's ranks they have helped to fill",

so wrote a high-minded, sensible private. Trifling misdeeds naturally led on to greater ones; and hence many besides the bad men required the touch of punishment. So punishment came, and in ample measure. Flogging, confinement, shaven heads, labels such as "Robber" pasted on the back, drumming out, and even death, put the fear of the Lord—or at least the fear of their generals—into the hearts of the soldiers. "Revelling in the Halls of the Montezumas", which had been the dream of enlistment with countless

troops and followers of the United States army. On the contrary their civil authorities will be respected, and protection and assistance will be given to them such as they should need or claim.—2., All honorable and peaceable inhabitants guaranteed to be such by the Municipality have permission to carry arms for the defence of the community, their persons and their property against robbers.—3., They are allowed to organise a neutral police force of twenty five armed and mounted men for protection of the town against robbers and for assisting the authorities in executing their duties, the criminals taken prisoners by them to be delivered over to the Governor of Puebla.—4., Permission is likewise granted to said authorities and inhabitants to defend themselves against any one who comes to plunder, robb or attack them, may he be robber, guerillero, or an American soldier.—5., The municipality of San Martin has permission, to arrest and remit to their commanding officers all American soldiers, they may find within the district of San Martin, drunk, dispersed or deserters.—6., It is strictly prohibited to the troops and followers of the United States army to open the prison at San Martin and put the criminals in liberty.—7., A copy of this Safeguard has been forwarded to the General in chief of the United States forces in order to communicate it to the commanding officers of the army, and of divisions, which have to pass by San Martin. Another copy has been remitted to the commanding officer of the military post at Rio Frio [on the farther side of San Martin]. The penalty for violating a safeguard was death. Numerous large monasteries, occupied by only a few monks, were found serviceable as barracks, and this use of them gave no offense. The aim was to arrange about quarters in such a way as to satisfy the local authorities.

young fellows, means now, lamented one of them after the Halls were captured, that if you are caught out by the patrol after eight P.M. you are put in the guard-house, and if noisy are handcuffed. No matter how stern the rule, occasional outrages were sure to occur; small offenses like snatching a bit of candy from a tray in the street or "mustering in" a few apples in an orchard could not be prevented; and here and there a subordinate officer of inferior quality, or one ambitious for popularity and later political success, would cause mischief; but substantially everything practicable was done by the commanders, and the efforts to reach the good sense and right feeling of the soldiers, instead of relying wholly upon the fear of punishment, were especially noticeable. One of Scott's general orders used this language: "Men free at home, must maintain the honor of free men when abroad. If they forget *that*, they will degrade themselves to the level of felons and slaves, and may be rightfully condemned and treated as such; for felons, according to the laws of God and man, are *slaves*".¹²

No less interesting were the efforts of our commanders to facilitate a proper administration of civil affairs. It was held fundamentally that peaceable inhabitants lost none of their political rights during American occupation, and on election days our troops were usually kept in their quarters or marched out of town. While always having it understood that our authority was paramount, the governors desired the Mexican officials to look after municipal affairs, and were generally disposed to co-operate with them in a liberal fashion to ensure the good order, the efficient and economical administration, and even the improvement of the towns. If the local authorities did not wish to hold office, they were usually permitted to retire, and successors were either elected by the people or appointed by the governor; but as a rule they felt it would promote the interests of the city to remain at their posts. At the capital Scott dissolved a refractory *ayuntamiento* and obtained in its place a body anxious to proceed in accord with him. Shields

¹² (3 per cent.) *House Ex. Doc. No. 60*, 30 Cong., 1 sess., p. 914. Meade, *Letters*, I. 161; *S. F. Nunelee, *Diary* (in the hands of the family). (Verse) J. J. Oswandel, *Notes of the Mexican War* (1885), p. 476. (Halls) *N. C. to J. L. Miller, May 7, 1848, Adj.-Gen.'s office; J. W. Buhoup, *Narrative of the Central Division* (1847), p. 50. N. Orl. *Picayune*, May 28, 1847; *G. H. Hughes, *Orders*, Adj.-Gen.'s office; *Scott, *Gen. Orders* 395, *ibid.*; *Chargé Doyle, nos. 1, 27, Mexico, January 13, March 14, 1848, P. R. O. The chief cause of trouble was that in spite of all efforts Mexicans would furnish our soldiers with liquor. It is worth mention that General Quitman, first military and civil governor of the capital, forbade (September 21, 1847) "any interference with or mutilation of the books, papers, or records contained within the Palace" (C. J. Biddle papers, in the hands of the family).

extinguished the *ayuntamiento* of Tampico for incompetence and malfeasance in office, and selected their successors.¹³

Mexican courts enjoyed complete freedom in dealing with affairs exclusively Mexican, and their decisions were enforced by our commanders. When citizens were brought before an American military commission, they were permitted to have counsel; but occasionally somewhat unusual methods had to be employed in dealing with suspected Mexicans, for persons ready to make any sort of an oath in defense of a fellow-countryman abounded. When an American was involved, whether as accused or as injured, our commanders took charge of the case, or had it brought before a special tribunal selected by themselves. At Tampico Shields appointed three Mexican judges, and then, for the trial of cases arising between Mexicans and Americans, added to this court three American citizens. The police were usually residents, though occasionally American soldiers did the work, and at Tampico an efficient American officer had charge for some time of this department. If reliable, the police received firm support from the commanding officer; if not, a change occurred. At Córdoba the city guards were permitted to carry only clubs, but such a restriction does not appear to have been usual. Attention was given to the care and lighting of the streets, sanitation, and the maintenance of schools, hospitals, prisons, and public works. Municipal taxes levied for such expenses continued to be paid under American rule, and at Jalapa additional funds were obtained by taxing the liquor saloons. At Puebla and Tampico the military authorities established chambers of commerce.¹⁴

¹³ (Rights) *Instrucciones otorgadas por la Junta General* (1847). (Elections) *D. Woodruff, Orders, April 25, 1848, Adj.-Gen.'s office; *W. O. Butler, Orders, March 31, 1848, *ibid.*; J. R. Kenly, *Memoirs of a Maryland Volunteer* (1873), p. 380. (Paramount) Worth, Proclamation, May 22, 1847, Ayunt. archives, Puebla. *Hughes to First Alcalde, Jalapa, December 13, 1847, Adj.-Gen.'s office; *Records of the Ayunts. of Mexico, Puebla, Jalapa, Vera Cruz, and numerous other cities. E. A. Hitchcock, *Fifty Years in Camp and Field* (1909), pp. 314-315; *N. P. Trist, no. 18, October 25, 1847, State Dept.; J. A. Quitman, Poster, September 16, Yale College Library; *Defensa de F. G. Iriarte* (1850); *Apuntes para la Historia*, p. 366; Rodríguez, *Breve Reseña* (1849), p. 5; *Shields to Adj.-Gen., January 19, 1847, Adj.-Gen.'s office; **id.* to Ayunt., January 2, 1847, Ayunt. archives, Tampico; *F. de Garay, January 22, 1847, War Dept. archives, Mexico.

¹⁴ (Courts) Wilhelm, *Eighth Infantry*, I. 299; *Worth to Vice-Gov., Saltillo, November 23, 1846, War Dept. archives, Mexico; **id.*, Orders, November 16, 1846, *ibid.*; *Marcy to Davenport, August 6, 1847, Adj.-Gen.'s office; *Wool, Orders, July 9, 1847, *ibid.*; Lawton, *Artillery Officer*, pp. 39, 40. (Counsel) *Worth to First Alcalde, May 22, 1847, Ayunt. archives, Puebla. (Unusual) *J. Hamtramck to McDowell, January 20, 1848, Adj.-Gen.'s office. (Police)

In this brief survey our attention has been directed to the principal fields of American activity, but the remoter districts also deserve mention. New Mexico and California were singularly instructive by contrast. In the former a political general bore sway, and there was a scene of license, debauchery, disease, misery, crime, and revolt. "The dirtiest, rowdiest crew I have ever seen collected together", was a responsible British traveller's description of the American forces; and a soldier wrote in his diary, "A more drunken and depraved set, I am sure, can never be found". In July, 1847, the veteran ex-editor of the *Washington Globe* said: "My son [Frank P. Blair, who had acted as United States district attorney of the province] represents the state of things in New Mexico as horrible. It seems as if even respectable men at home have become so depraved by the license of the region they are in, that they stick at no enormity whatever." In California, on the other hand, a regular officer, Colonel R. B. Mason of the First Dragoons, had command. Some thought his character hard; but probably all clear-headed persons recognized that it was just, and as a matter of fact he believed in combining strength with kindness. Able, sensible, experienced, honest, and alert, free from yearnings for popularity and political advantage, he ruled successfully from May, 1847, to the close of the war. Malcontents were held in check without harshness. Over-ardent American citizens encountered at headquarters a prudent conservatism. Troops that might easily have made trouble yielded to a quiet pressure. Well-disposed Californians found themselves protected and considered. Entanglements were avoided, difficulties foreseen, and all necessary precautions taken without fear and without excitement.¹⁵

*G. Morgan to Martínez, January 18, 1847, War Dept. archives, Mexico; R. M'Sherry, *El Puchero* (1850), p. 163; *Worth to Ayunt., May 17, 1847, Ayunt. archives, Puebla; *id. to Guerrero alcalde, August 1, 1846, Adj.-Gen.'s office; *id. to Bliss, September 28, 1846, *ibid.*; *H. L. Scott to Hughes, January 22, 1848, *ibid.*; *Shields, Orders 3, *ibid.*; Lawton, *Artillery Officer*, p. 17; *Gaceta de Tamaulipas*, July 16, 1846; *Quitman, Orders, Mexico, October 6, 1847, British Museum; *Worth, Proclam., November 16, 1846, War Dept. archives, Mexico; *Gates, Orders, March 30, 1847, Adj.-Gen.'s office; *H. Wilson, Orders 142, November 29, 1847, *ibid.*; *J. Bankhead, Orders 11, February 16, 1848, *ibid.* (Schools, etc.) *Flag of Freedom*, no. 1, Puebla; *F. de Garay, January 22, 1847, War Dept. archives, Mexico; *Doc. sent by Garay, December 20, 1846, *ibid.*; *American Eagle*, Vera Cruz, May 22, 1847; *Gov. to Ayunt., Jalapa, February 28, 1848, Ayunt. archives; *id. to First Alcalde, January 17, 1848, *ibid.*; *Shields, Orders, January 1, 2, 1847, Adj.-Gen.'s office. *Worth, Orders 49, October 17, 1846, *ibid.* In regard to these matters the documentary evidence is not complete for every town, but to a certain extent one may safely rely upon analogy.

¹⁵ A list of the documents upon which this paragraph is based would fill

The case of Mazatlán, the principal port of the western coast, offers particular interest, because the navy had charge; and in that branch of the service there were no volunteers, no politics, and with a few exceptions no scheming for popular glory. Commodore Shubrick announced that he desired the people to regard our banner with friendly feelings, and that, so far as he possessed the power, he would confer benefits instead of inflicting mischiefs upon them. A moderate scale of customs dues, commerce with all ports except those of Mexico, the free exportation of gold, silver, and produce, and the free importation of quicksilver, an essential in mining operations, was promised; and an arrangement effected with the city authorities provided that, aside from military affairs, municipal officers should retain their power, all peaceable inhabitants and their property be protected, everything used by the American forces be purchased at a fair valuation, one hundred citizens be organized as a police guard, and the sale of liquor—prohibited so far as men in the service of the United States were concerned—be under military control. The Mexican commander, who had retired a short distance from the city on the arrival of the invaders, fulminated with such protestations and threats against this arrangement, that it was annulled by the quaking city council; but the people met, re-affirmed its provisions, and elected representatives to carry them into effect. The results proved entirely satisfactory. Gaxiola, the Mexican historian of the war in Sinaloa, felt compelled to say: "Regrettable, very regrettable it is to confess as much, but it is a certain fact that after" the Mexican commander and his troops "left this port, order, morality, public security, and all that constitutes the true liberty of peoples were re-established"; only some slight faults, no outrages, were committed; and the Americans behaved "like gentlemen". As a pendant to this may be mentioned Laguna in Campeche, the other principal case of naval occupation. Under American rule it became more flourishing than it had ever been. The officer in command was so popular that he might perhaps have got up

several pages, but it seems unnecessary to cite more than a few of them. (New Mexico) G. F. Ruxton, *Adventures in Mexico* (1848), p. 190; *Hastings, Diary; clipping from St. Louis *Republican* in Hitchcock Papers, Lib. of Cong.; Wash. *Union*, October 3, November 25, 1846; *Niles' Register*, LXXII. 252, 375; Kribben letters in *Anzeiger des Westens*, 1847; *G. R. Gibson, Diary, Mo. Hist. Soc.; *Blair to Van Buren, July 7, 1847, Van Buren Papers, Lib. of Cong. (California) Mason's reports, Adj.-Gen.'s office; Stevenson's order-book and letter-book, New York Hist. Soc.; *House Ex. Doc. No. 17*, 31 Cong., 1 sess.; *House Ex. Doc. No. 70*, 30 Cong., 1 sess.; Sherman Papers, Lib. of Cong. The documents relating to this stage of California history are almost without end.

a revolution on his own account ; and when the treaty of peace went into effect, the people begged Commodore Perry to let the American forces remain.¹⁶

On the whole, though much that was deplorable and even without excuse occurred in the north, and unfortunate incidents happened occasionally elsewhere, the history of American rule in Mexico was distinctly creditable to us. Confident predictions of rapine, that were made abroad, fell to the ground. Scott, a man well versed in the annals of campaigns, asserted that his troops displayed "the highest moral deportment and discipline ever known in an invading army". The British chargé d'affaires, after making careful inquiries all the way from Vera Cruz to the capital, stated with reference to our troops, that "Even from the account of the Mexicans themselves they seem to have behaved very well". Gutiérrez de Estrada, a Mexican of high standing, said to his fellow-citizens, that the Americans occupying the country ensured them security of person and possessions and all proper satisfactions better than their own governments had ever done. U. S. Grant, who served in the war, said afterwards: "I question whether the great majority of the Mexican people did not regret our departure as much as they had regretted our coming." And when one considers the relative infrequency of serious outrages and the relatively small number of individuals injured, the great sums of money paid for labor and supplies, the reduced prices of almost all manufactured articles, the prevention of brigandage, insurrections, and civil as well as military extortion, tyranny, and outrages, the promotion of trade and commerce through the removal of excessive taxes upon them, the good ideas of municipal administration often exhibited by the governors of towns, and the fine examples of subordination to authority, both military and civil, presented by all grades of our troops from the private up to the commander-in-chief—when these things are considered, one may well feel that our rule was a blessing to the people who experienced it. Nor did this fail to be recognized broadly. Higher than all opinions on the subject, however conspicuous, towers an extraordinary fact. One of the principal difficulties—perhaps the greatest of all—in the way of negotiating a treaty of peace with Mexico was the desire felt by a large part of the nation that we,

¹⁶ *House Ex. Doc. No. 1*, 30 Cong., 2 sess., pp. 1092, 1104, 1109. J. X. Gaxiola, *Invasión Norte-Americana en Sinaloa* (second ed., 1891), pp. 168-169, 176-177, 181, 217, 223. R. S. Semmes, *Service Afloat and Ashore* (1851), pp. 85-87.

their victorious adversaries, though never in reality their enemies, should subjugate and permanently rule the entire country.¹⁷

JUSTIN H. SMITH.

¹⁷ *London Times*, January 4, 1848; Scott, *Memoirs*, II. 396; *Doyle, no. 1, January 13, 1848, P. R. O.; J. M. Gutiérrez de Estrada, *México en 1840 y en 1847*; Grant, *Personal Memoirs* (1885), I. 118. (Desire) *Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 52*, 30 Cong., 1 sess., pp. 207, 241 (Trist); *Bankhead, nos. 42, 43, April 30, no. 58, May 29, 1847, P. R. O.; Letter from Mexico, *London Times*, May 10, 1847; Ramírez, *México durante su Guerra con los EE. UU.* (1905), pp. 239, 248, 275; *"B." to Moses Y. Beach, undated, Relaciones archives, Mexico; *Mexico Ayunt. to governor of Fed. Dist., September 3, 1847, Ayunt. archives; Tampico letter, *London Times*, November 6, 1846; *House Ex. Doc. No. 60*, 30 Cong., 1 sess., p. 1047 (Scott).

THE NEWSPAPER PROBLEM IN ITS BEARING UPON MILITARY SECRECY DURING THE CIVIL WAR

IN every modern war the control of the agencies and channels of publicity has presented a serious problem. According to the regulations in use in the present European war, correspondents must keep their distance from the scene of action, and the public must be content with such "hand-picked" news touching military movements as the belligerent governments see fit to issue. The journalistic profession may complain of the curtailment of correspondents' privileges, the occasional suppression of papers, the governmental control of communication, the censorship of casualty lists, the restrictive instructions and regulations of official press bureaus, the exclusion of generals' names from war reports, the lack of definiteness in official *communiqués*, and the heavy penalties enforced against offending papers. Yet where these safeguards are absent, there is a serious weakening of military effectiveness. When one contemplates the full result of a loose policy toward newspapers during war, the case for some form of news control becomes a convincing one. The American Civil War presents a significant field for study in this connection, for the double reason that a period of remarkably keen journalistic enterprise coincided with a time of laxity in the matter of press control. Acting under no effective governmental restraint, the newspapers of the North, though in many ways deserving of admiration, undoubtedly did the national cause serious injury by continually revealing military information, undermining confidence in the management of public affairs, and giving undue publicity to the virtues of ambitious generals and the sensational features of the war. The present article is offered with the hope that there may now be an element of timeliness in the consideration of the military consequences of newspaper activity during that period.

In dealing with the novel question of censorship and news control enough was done by the Washington authorities to show that they realized the seriousness of the problem. During the gloomy days of April, 1861, the telegraph lines from Washington were brought within the exclusive control of the government, and an extra-legal censorship of a sort was established. The censor, H. E. Thayer, was instructed by Secretary Seward to prevent the issue

of all telegraphic messages from Washington relating to "the civil or military operations of the government", and it was understood that only a bare statement of the essential facts without extended comment would be allowed in the despatches. No mention of the criticism of General Stone for the Ball's Bluff disaster was permitted; the press was not allowed to say that senators and others of influence had urged Sherman's removal; a report of the dissatisfaction of the people of Minnesota at the withdrawal of their troops from the Mississippi Valley for the defense of the Atlantic river line was withheld from the wires, and the papers were to be silent regarding cabinet objections to Secretary Cameron's official report. There was a free censorship of despatches of a political, personal, or general sort, and correspondents were deterred from sending messages whose publication seemed improbable.

It thus appears that from the outset of the war a censorship existed. Its habitat varied, for at different times it resided with the Treasury, War, and State departments. Though this censorship was so partial and feeble as to be ineffective, yet the inevitable outcry from the newspapers, with the equally inevitable echoes of sympathy in Congress, arose. The newspaper men complained of unreasonable strictness in the censoring of their despatches, of an unequal policy which benefited some papers at the expense of others, and of an occasional looseness which resulted in unfortunate "leaks". It was regarded as an outrage that a communication to the New York *Tribune* professing to give advance information as to the President's annual message to Congress should be "killed", while a despatch to the New York *Herald* with the same data should be allowed to go. Considering the instructions under which the censor was to keep back all news regarding the Trent affair prior to the publication of the official correspondence between Seward and Lyons, it was considered unpardonable that the unpopular Russell of the London *Times* should be permitted to use the wires in transmitting to a friend intelligence that proved useful in stock trading. In harmony with complaints of this sort from the newspaper world, the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, charged with an investigation of the telegraphic censorship, reported that wholesome political discussion and criticism were restrained, that numerous despatches were suppressed, that the censor was unequal to his position, and that the censorship had been carried too far.¹

As early as August 2, 1861, an attempt was made to obviate the necessity of undue official interference by the establishment of a

¹ Report of House Committee on Judiciary, March 20, 1862, *House Report No. 64*, 37 Cong., 2 sess.

sort of "gentlemen's agreement" between the government and the press. General McClellan had a conference with the representatives of the leading journals, and an understanding was reached whereby the papers were to refrain from publishing any information that would give aid or comfort to the enemy, while the government was to afford facilities for the transmission of suitable information. This well-meant experiment, which Russell cynically called a "curiosity",² proved a failure, for it placed too great a strain upon the consciences of correspondents and gave too great an advantage to certain less scrupulous papers which did not subscribe to the agreement.

After considerable experimentation, an administrative policy of news control was ultimately evolved. The censoring function was transferred from the State to the War Department, and it was ordered that, beginning with February 2, 1862, the President, by virtue of congressional authorization, would establish a military supervision of all telegraphic lines in the United States. All telegraphic communications touching military matters not authorized by the Secretary of War, or the commanding general of the district, were forbidden; no further facilities for receiving information by telegraph or transporting their papers by railroad were to be extended to journals violating the order; and for the general supervision of telegraphic business a special officer was appointed with the title of Assistant Secretary of War and General Manager of Military Telegraphs.³ In the sifting of news the American Telegraph Company co-operated with the government, requiring oaths of secrecy and allegiance from employees and allowing no access to the messages or the operating rooms except to those duly authorized by the government telegraph manager. No unofficial messages conveying military information were transmitted by wire, and news-writers were forced to bring in their war stories in person, to employ a messenger, or to use the mails. As a further precaution communications were sent in code, the cipher operator constituting at all times an important medium between officers.⁴

Though these various precautions indicate that the government regarded secrecy as an important consideration, yet they were but half-way measures, and at no time could it be said that the news channels were effectively closed. In the early days of the censor-

² W. H. Russell, *My Diary, North and South*, August 5, 1861; see also July 10.

³ *House Report* (above cited); *Official Records, War of the Rebellion*, second series, II. 40; third series, I. 324, 394.

⁴ J. M. Schofield, *Forty-Six Years in the Army*, p. 169.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXIII.—20.

ship, the transmission of "contraband" intelligence through the telegraph offices of Baltimore, Philadelphia, and New York was not prevented. Information of a highly confidential character might be suppressed in Washington and then sent over the wires from other points.⁵ When for instance a *Tribune* writer found that the Secretary of War had ordered the censor to suppress all news from Fredericksburg, the forbidden article was sent by messenger on a night train.⁶ Even after the control of the telegraph became general, messages could be freely sent by mail and this became the regular method by which news reporters conveyed their "copy". Excessive caution had to be exercised to prevent official despatches from being intercepted. Through a mysterious "leak" in the staff of General Pope, his telegrams to Halleck were immediately sent to New York and published. In consequence of this situation an order from Halleck to Pope directed that reporters be removed, and that no telegrams be sent over the wires except those sent by Pope himself.⁷ Everywhere throughout the war unauthorized news was continually finding its way into print through numerous unsealed channels.

In striking contrast with the feebleness of the censorship was the activity of the various news-gathering agencies. It is doubtful whether any war has ever been as fully "covered" as the Civil War. The leading New York dailies spent huge sums on their "war departments"—half a million being spent by the *Herald* alone—and an army of "specials" was placed in the field whose stories form a notable record of adventure and activity. We read of correspondents facing the battle-fire while writing from the field, carrying the confidential messages of men high in authority, making desperate rides to bring the first news of important events, entering the service as nurses or signal officers in order to secure the best opportunities for observation, adopting clever ruses to evade the guards or outwit rivals, writing steadily all night as sheet after sheet of "copy" was handed to the printers, and, in short, leading lives of thrilling excitement and of exacting strenuousness. The stories of Richardson and Browne of the *Tribune* running the blockade at Vicksburg, of Osbon, the *Herald* correspondent, hoisting Farragut's signals as the Gulf squadron ran the gauntlet of the Confederate batteries at New Orleans, of Henry Villard bringing to Washington and to the *Tribune* the news of Fredericksburg after a perilous night ride through a "sea of mire", of Stedman, after

⁵ *House Report No. 64*, 37 Cong., 2 sess.

⁶ F. Lauriston Bullard, *Famous War Correspondents* (London, 1914), p. 396.

⁷ *Offic. Rec.*, first series, vol. XII., pt. 3, pp. 608-609.

two days of furious riding, inditing a six-column report for the *World* with his feverish head tied in towels—these stories will bear many a retelling and will always command applause and respect.⁸

Usually the correspondents were accorded the most liberal privileges. Government passes were put into their hands; they had the use of government horses and wagons; they were given transportation with baggage privileges on government steamers and military trains. They enjoyed the confidence of admirals and army commanders, and were seldom at a loss to obtain the information they desired. Staying behind the lines as they usually did, they heard an immense deal of officers' talk, and could pick up not only the camp gossip but also many telling snatches of military information. One of the *Herald* correspondents possessed a pass which entitled him "to accompany naval expeditions in any staff capacity to which the commanders might appoint him provided they did not interfere with the regulations of the Navy".⁹ At Antietam a special writer for the *Tribune* carried several of General Hooker's messages and orders.¹⁰ In their own estimation these newspaper men constituted a privileged class, and indeed the treatment they often received bore out the opinion.

From the standpoint of the government and the generals all this newspaper activity was highly pernicious. Not only was valuable information constantly exposed, but discontent in the army resulted from an airing of petty complaints, the names of generals and lesser officers were paraded to gratify personal ambition, sensational news-writing was unduly stimulated, and the very elements out of which war is engendered—hatred and misunderstanding—were intensified. Good "copy" for a day's reading being the object, truth and accuracy became altogether secondary considerations. The average reporter, under the pressure of a constant demand for news, would just as soon chat with a disgruntled subordinate officer and print his story as to search for reliable information from a safe source. Besides, the safe source would not talk. As the "specials" were in nearly every case civilians without military expertness, they often incorrectly interpreted what they saw, and of course erred grievously when they presumed to foretell coming movements. Partly because everything was written under headlines, and partly because each day's issue must contain something important, the news-writers fell into the inevitable habit of exaggerating their stories and spreading their pictures on huge canvasses. In the case of local papers

⁸ Bullard, *Famous War Correspondents*, ch. XIV., *passim*.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 403.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 399.

with limited constituencies there was the further necessity of playing up the exploits of favorite sons. Their little heroes became big fools, as Sherman observed, when these accounts were copied in the metropolitan dailies. No sooner was a battle fought than every colonel and captain in it became illustrious. For a month after Shiloh the average newspaper reader in Illinois and Missouri would have supposed that McClelland's and Lew Wallace's achievements on that field were far superior to Sherman's, whereas in reality their parts were quite subordinate.¹¹ It was, indeed, the hard-headed and efficient general who was most likely to be written down, while those who achieved dazzling glory were almost always of second-rate quality.¹² Because the laconic Grant would not disclose his plans to visitors, the newspapers denounced him as idle, intemperate, and incompetent, such men as Frémont and McClelland being designated as suitable successors.¹³ So desperate did Grant become at one time because of the use of the press against him by his rivals that he planned to return home, and his purpose was only altered by Sherman's strenuous persuasion.¹⁴ It was not uncommon for disappointed correspondents to vent their spite by misrepresenting generals and falsely reporting conditions in the army. When General Cox in his West Virginia campaign declined to allow correspondents to be taken into the officers' mess and given military rank, they proceeded to write down the general and to describe his army as a rabble of ruffians and plunderers incompetently commanded.¹⁵ In addition to these evil effects, popular impatience for victory was voiced through the press, and unnecessary bloodshed

¹¹ M. A. De Wolfe Howe (ed.), *Home Letters of General Sherman* (New York, 1909), p. 227.

¹² The generosity which General Rosecrans, not without ulterior motives, exhibited toward correspondents is well presented in the *Memoirs of Henry Villard*, war correspondent of the *New York Tribune*. Rosecrans received Villard with profuse cordiality on slight acquaintance, invited him to his mess, and offered to furnish sleeping quarters, horses, and servants. In his conversations with Villard the general freely criticized his superiors (suggesting, for instance, that Halleck and Stanton should be got out of the way) and gave intimations as to his plans. He even allowed the newspaper representative to read his reports in advance of their transmission to Washington, and to copy them for publication. Villard declined the proffered privileges, and refused to be Rosecrans's mouthpiece, but W. B. Bickham of the *Cincinnati Commercial* showed no such scruples and served as the general's publicity agent. Thomas, the successor of Rosecrans, was much more cautious and reserved in his dealings with correspondents. *Memoirs of Henry Villard*, II. 212 ff.

¹³ *Personal Memoirs of U. S. Grant*, I. 458.

¹⁴ *Home Letters of General Sherman*, pp. 227-228.

¹⁵ R. U. Johnson and C. C. Buel, *Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*, I. 141-142.

resulted from ill-advised engagements fought in deference to public clamor.

Sherman was, not without reason, the most emphatic in his strictures against newspapers. Early in his career, Northern journals kept harping on his "insanity", and so desperate were the general's feelings because of this abuse that he, like Grant, contemplated resignation. A Cincinnati editor, when asked why he repeated the slanders against Sherman, declared that it was a news item of the day and that he had to keep up with the times.¹⁶

Sherman had only disdain for the "cheap flattery of the press", which aspirants for public applause could secure by favors shown, at public cost, to correspondents. In his various campaigns the general did what he could to eliminate that class of men "who will not fight, but who follow our army to pick up news for sale, and who are more used to bolster up idle and worthless officers than to notice the hard-working and meritorious whose modesty is equal to their courage". This puffing of some officers and pulling down of others plays into the hands of the enemy, he said, by sowing dissension, and "encourages discontent among the officers who find themselves abused by men seemingly under the influence of officers high in command".¹⁷

In an indignant letter to his brother, Sherman declared:

To every army and almost every general a newspaper reporter goes along, filling up our transports, swelling our trains, reporting our progress, guessing at places, picking up dropped expressions, inciting jealousy and discontent, and doing infinite mischief. . . . The press has now killed McClellan, Buell, Fitz-John Porter, Sumner, Franklin, and Burnside. Add my name and I am not ashamed of the association.

Again he exclaimed:

Who gave notice of McDowell's movement on Manassas, and enabled Johnston so to reinforce Beauregard that our army was defeated? The press. Who gave notice of the movement on Vicksburg? The press. Who has prevented all our secret combinations and movements against our enemy? The press. . . . What has paralyzed the Army of the Potomac? Mutual jealousies kept alive by the press. What has enabled the enemy to combine so as to hold Tennessee after we have twice crossed it with victorious armies? . . . The press. I cannot pick up a paper but tells of our situation here, in the mud, sickness, and digging a canal in which we have little faith. But our officers attempt secretly to cut two other channels . . . whereby we could turn . . . all the strategic points on the main river, and the busy agents of the press

¹⁶ *Memoirs of General W. T. Sherman*, I. 243-246.

¹⁷ *The Sherman Letters* (New York, 1894), pp. 187 ff. (This volume contains the correspondence between General W. T. Sherman and his brother, John Sherman.)

follow up and proclaim to the world the whole thing, and instead of surprising our enemy we find him felling trees and blocking passages that would without this have been in our possession, and all the real effects of surprise are lost. . . . The only two really successful military strokes out here have succeeded because of the absence of newspapers or by throwing them off the trail. Halleck had to make a simulated attack on Columbus to prevent the press giving notice of his intended move against Forts Henry and Donelson.¹⁸

It is no wonder that the general gave the position of emphasis on the concluding page of his *Memoirs* to a denunciation of newspaper correspondents. They are the "world's gossips", he said, gradually drifting to the headquarters of some general, who finds it easier to make reputation at home than with his own corps or division. They are also tempted to prophesy events and state facts which, to an enemy, reveal a purpose in time to guard against it. Moreover, they are always bound to see facts colored by the partisan or political character of their own patrons, and thus bring army officers into the political controversies of the day.¹⁹

By far the most serious count in the indictment against newspapers was their constant revelation of military information. It would seem that the copy for the papers underwent no sifting to eliminate contraband news, for we find casualty lists with full data as to the location of military units, statements of expected reinforcements, revelations of the amount of force commanded by various generals, speculations as to plans, reports of the location and strength of batteries, and many other similar items. An account of Grant's movements, selected at random from the *New York Daily News*, gives the course of march of a division of cavalry, refers to reinforcements from Meade, and proclaims the assembling of Generals Grant, Meade, and Butler at General Burnside's headquarters.²⁰ This is but typical of the sort of detailed information which the papers constantly supplied. At the time Lee did not know that Burnside was still with Grant.²¹

In another copy of the same paper one could read that heavy trains were continually running to and from City Point, transporting supplies and forage for men and animals, and that preparations for a permanent occupation of City Point were being pushed.²² The *New York Times* of November 10, 1864, published a statement of Sherman's exact strength and of his intended programme. Grant

¹⁸ *The Sherman Letters*, February 18, 1863.

¹⁹ *Memoirs of General Sherman*, II. 408.

²⁰ *New York Daily News*, July 2, 1864. (The report was dated near Petersburg, June 28.)

²¹ *Lee's Confidential Dispatches* (New York, 1915), p. 272.

²² *New York Daily News*, July 11, 1864.

complained to Stanton of the publication of this "contraband news", and in an answering telegram Stanton admitted that the department could not prevent such disclosures.²³ After certain Memphis papers had published the location of guns which Grant had secretly placed for his operations against Vicksburg, a Confederate major, while conferring with Sherman over the exchange of prisoners, facetiously requested that the Federals should not "open those batteries to-morrow night", explaining that it was his intention to give a party and he did not wish to be disturbed. Grant was furious at this disclosure, but it was the sort of thing that one should have expected, considering the laxness of control over such matters.²⁴

While Sherman was operating in Georgia, the Indianapolis *Journal* published a statement that Sherman had returned to Atlanta on a given date with five corps of his army, leaving two corps in Tennessee to watch Hood, that he had destroyed certain sections of railroad, and was marching for Charleston. Sherman sent a hot telegram asking the authorities to catch "that fool" and have him sent to work on the forts, advising further that misleading accounts be published to produce mystification as to his programme.²⁵

So bitter was Sherman's feeling against newspapers that he is said to have refused an introduction to Greeley, explaining that Greeley's paper had caused him a heavy loss of men in his Carolina campaign of 1865. By clever feints he had concealed his plans until the Confederate general Hardee got hold of a copy of the New York *Tribune* which contained a most obliging editorial. At last the editor "had the satisfaction to inform his readers [General Hardee was one of the readers] that General Sherman would next be heard from about Goldsboro because his supply vessels from Savannah were known to be rendezvousing at Morehead City". This disclosure cost the Union commander a fight which he had hoped to avoid.²⁶

There is ample evidence of the close scrutiny of the Northern papers by Confederate generals. This was particularly true of General Lee, who constantly perused the columns of these journals with the eye of a military expert on the lookout for information as to developments within the lines of the Army of the Potomac. On one occasion he noted a statement of the Philadelphia *Inquirer* regarding McClellan's movements which convinced him that a with-

²³ *Offic. Rec.*, first series, vol. XXXIX., pt. 3, pp. 740, 749.

²⁴ *Home Letters of General Sherman*, p. 247 (April 10, 1863).

²⁵ C. A. Dana, *Recollections of the Civil War*, pp. 216-217.

²⁶ *Memoirs of General Sherman*, II. 292; editorial, *Army and Navy Journal*, March 10, 1917, p. 885.

drawal of troops from Richmond was a safe measure. On another occasion he read in the same sheet that the Army of the Potomac was being reinforced by a heavy contingent under Pope. Again he found in a Philadelphia paper an admission of Sherman's failure at Kenesaw Mountain with the extent of his loss and a statement of Federal losses in other engagements. From the *Wheeling Intelligencer* of January 23, 1865, he learned that ten or fifteen thousand of Thomas's troops were in Bellaire awaiting transportation on the Baltimore and Ohio railroad, from which he concluded that Grant was bringing his troops east with the intention of moving upon Richmond at the first favorable opportunity. As indicated by his confidential despatches, it was Lee's custom after reading these papers to pass them on to President Davis, with comments on those items that possessed special interest. At the same time that Lee was reaping the benefit of these disclosures, the leaders of the Northern army were generally quite mystified about his own forces in Virginia. He also appears to have seen through certain misleading statements which were published in Northern papers with the intention of throwing the enemy off the trail.²⁷

For a glimpse into the typical methods of journalists in handling military information, one may turn to the accounts bearing on the combined land and sea expedition which left Hampton Roads for Wilmington, N. C., in December, 1864. In the first place the importance of Wilmington as a Confederate base was made thoroughly public by references in Southern and English papers to the extensive commerce of the place, and the large amounts of government property deposited there.²⁸ These accounts were republished in Northern journals and may well have been of influence in attracting attention to the port as a profitable point of attack. At the time the expedition started the *New York Times* (of the morning of December 16, 1864) came out with a prominently headed article on the first page. These were the headlines: "Highly important—A new and formidable expedition—Its departure from Fortress Monroe on Tuesday—Where is it going?" Then followed a detailed account from their special correspondent, dated off Cape Henry, December 13. The next day the *Tribune* editor wrote a teasing editorial, declaring that the secret was as formidable as the expedition and speculating as to whether this pro-administration newspaper would be closed for publishing such highly contraband news. On the 19th the *Times* published a statement that the fleet had been

²⁷ *Lee's Confidential Despatches*, pp. 51, 223, 265, 331.

²⁸ J. B. Jones, *A Rebel War Clerk's Diary*, July 26, 1864, and January 3, 1865.

sighted off New Inlet, N. C., and gave a full list of the vessels. The *Times* articles had given no disclosure of the fleet's destination, the editor facetiously remarking that it was "starting for some point on the rebel coast between Norfolk and Galveston", but the New York *Daily News* of the 20th gave further details, reporting that the expedition had reached Cape Hatteras on Saturday, that Admiral Porter and General Butler were the commanders, and that an attack on Wilmington was the purpose. On the 22nd the Confederate Secretary of War telegraphed in cipher to Lee declaring that Wilmington was threatened, and might be attacked at any time, and asking Lee to meet the necessity.²⁹ The exasperation of the Federal Secretary of the Navy, Welles, is shown by an indignant outburst in his *Diary* in which he declared that the papers were disclosing confidential circumstances pertaining to the expedition which should by no means be made public. The matter was regarded as of sufficient seriousness to merit consideration in cabinet meeting, and the President was in favor of making an example of the offending correspondent, but no arrest seems to have been made, owing to friction between the official heads of the War and Navy departments.³⁰ By the time the first attack on Wilmington took place, December 24, 1864, the enemy had been amply warned, so that in this unsuccessful engagement and also in the bombardment of January 13 and 14 which resulted in the capture of Fort Fisher, the Union forces were denied the advantage of surprise.

When we turn to a consideration of the Southern press we find something of the same laxness, but there were less serious disclosures of information, partly because of greater discretion, perhaps, on the part of Southern papers, and also because control was stricter and the sum total of newspaper activity far less. As the Confederate papers came frequently within the Union lines, besides being copied in Northern news columns, the information they contained was at all times available to Union generals. Under these circumstances it was recognized that silence was the only feasible policy. Accordingly the publication of newspaper statements as to movements of troops was prohibited, correspondents were ordinarily excluded from the lines, reports of military operations were submitted to the appropriate commanding officer before publication, and severe penalties were enforced against editors who disclosed army secrets or published statements likely to impair confidence in the officers. Warnings and confidential instructions were from time

²⁹ *Lee's Confidential Dispatches*, p. 310.

³⁰ *Diary of Gideon Welles*, II. 205-207.

to time issued to the papers, and the practice of silence and caution was carefully fostered.

In the attainment of military secrecy and editorial restraint the results at the South, while not ideal, were at least generally satisfactory. When the Confederate General Early was operating in Virginia in 1864 with a force so limited that secrecy was absolutely essential to success, warnings were sent to the papers "not to allude even by implication" to the movements of troops. The correspondent of the Richmond *Inquirer* had information of Early's movements, but, with a degree of self-control that was rare in his profession, wrote his paper not to make the information public.³¹ Even news of victory was sometimes withheld from an eager people lest the enemy should derive the first intelligence of their disaster from Confederate papers.³² Sherman at various times testified to Confederate success in guarding military information, and declared at one time that while everything his own army attempted to do was paraded, yet he looked in vain for scraps in Southern papers from which to guess at the disposition of the enemy's forces. At another time he referred to the South moving "their forces from Virginia to Mississippi and back without a breath spoken or written".³³ The problem of keeping the enemy mystified seems to have been carefully studied, and at times spurious information was furnished. For instance, in 1862, when Jackson was on his way to Richmond to support Lee, Confederate editors published accounts of reinforcements sent to Jackson in the Shenandoah valley.³⁴

³¹ *Lee's Confidential Dispatches*, July 15, 1864, pp. 240-241.

³² Jones, *Rebel War Clerk's Diary*, October 11, 1864.

³³ *Home Letters of General Sherman*, pp. 238, 240.

³⁴ This information was published at the request of Lee, who knew of McClellan's habit of reading the Richmond journals. Reinforcements had actually been sent earlier, but at the time the newspapers had maintained silence. While Lincoln and McClellan were exchanging telegrams concerning the reinforcement of Jackson, the latter was already half-way to Richmond. The importance of secrecy in Jackson's movement lay in the fact that the Confederates were greatly outnumbered, and the true Union policy was to concentrate against Richmond. It was Jackson's diversion in the valley and the panicky dread of an attack upon Washington that caused the Federal authorities to retain McDowell's army corps which had been promised to McClellan, to divert part of McDowell's troops into the valley, and to withhold the forces under Frémont, Banks, Milroy, and Shields, which ought to have co-operated in the Richmond campaign. A disclosure of Jackson's movements, by newspaper indiscretion or otherwise, would have completely upset Confederate strategy. McClellan, at the time, conceived himself to be confronted by an army far superior to his own, and this belief, as well as his clamoring for reinforcements, was published in Northern papers which reached Richmond. This known timidity on the part of their adversary emboldened the Southern generals. *Richmond Dispatch*, June 18, 1862; Rich-

Besides guarding secrets, the Southern press did much to develop and preserve a high morale among the people and the soldiers. In reporting the many indecisive engagements near Richmond, the editors of the South would always claim victory while the Northern papers were exaggerating Union disasters or complaining that the successes achieved by Federal arms were not more conclusive. To use a familiar athletic term, the men in the field were well supported "on the side lines". With admirable cleverness the best interpretation was put upon Southern reverses. When the earlier promises of moving on to Washington and New York failed to materialize, the papers began to preach the theory that the whole purpose was the defense of the Southern capital. Thus Gettysburg and Antietam were heralded as defensive victories. Always the superior fighting power of Confederates over Unionists was assumed in the newspaper comments, and that fighting spirit which goes with an air of invincibleness was engendered.³⁵

In spite, however, of all this caution there were occasional breaches of discretion on the part of Southern papers. The "rebel war clerk" Jones declared that the enemy "seemed to have speedy and accurate information from Richmond not only of all movements of our army, but of the intentions of the government. . . . They know every disposition of our forces from day to day sooner than our own people!"³⁶ The publication of his army's movements at times frustrated Lee's plans, as for instance when the papers heralded the sending of Longstreet to the Western army, which was intended to be a secret.³⁷ Beauregard, who suffered at various times from reporters, complained in 1861 that the real extent of his numerical strength as well as his intended operations were revealed by newspapers and requested the Secretary of War to exclude reporters from the vicinity of his army.³⁸

In the last desperate months of Southern resistance, some interesting disclosures came from a quite unexpected source. President Jefferson Davis, after the fall of Atlanta, visited Georgia to stem the tide of opposition led by Governor Brown. In speaking at Macon he explained that reinforcements were not sent to Georgia from Richmond *Enquirer*, June 19, 1862; Rhodes, *History of the United States*, IV. 36; G. F. R. Henderson, *Stonewall Jackson and the American Civil War*, II. 4, and I. xiv, 314, 413, 415; T. N. Page, *Robert E. Lee*, pp. 136 ff., esp. p. 157.

³⁵ Grant on Wilderness Campaign, *Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*, IV. 149.

³⁶ Jones, *A Rebel War Clerk's Diary*, March 1, 1865.

³⁷ R. E. Lee, jr., *Recollections and Letters of General Lee* (New York, 1905), p. 416.

³⁸ *Offic. Rec.*, first series, vol. LI., pt. 2, p. 152.

Virginia because the troops were sorely needed to oppose Grant. He referred to the alarming proportion of men who were "absent without leave", and called upon the deserters to return. To freshen the hopes of his people he announced the plan of harassing Sherman's communications by cavalry raids and declared that soon the enemy would be driven beyond Chattanooga.³⁹ The various speeches made on this visit were published in Southern and copied in Northern papers, so that Sherman could anticipate the promised attacks and take the proper precautionary measures. Here and there we find other news disclosures at the South, and occasionally in the issuing of a sharp order reference would be made to the unfortunate publication of valuable information, but it appears that, on the whole, the South surpassed the North in the discretion of its editors and the effectiveness of its methods of dealing with the press.

In our consideration so far, we have been taking into view those journalistic faults which are consistent with loyalty and patriotism. In the North, however, during the Civil War, there were many powerful papers whose malignant attitude toward the administration amounted to disloyalty and active sympathy with the enemy. The utterances of such papers as the *New York World* and *Daily News*, the *Baltimore Exchange*, the *South*, the *Maryland Daily News*, the *Columbus (Ohio) Crisis*, and the *Chicago Times* were so vicious that suppression or the arrest of their editors seemed but mild forms of punishment. The publicity which these papers gave to military information was as pernicious as in the case of the "loyal" or "administration" press, and there was the added vice of deliberate purpose to undermine the government's plans. In such sheets the whole conflict was denounced as a "Black Republican" war, governmental measures were characterized as tyrannous attempts to overthrow civil liberty in the North, the President was referred to as an imbecile or despot, and the secessionists were applauded. While continually denouncing the attacks on the "freedom of the press", their unrestrained abuse was itself the best evidence that such freedom had been allowed to proceed to the point of shameless license.

One of the favorite tricks of the *New York Daily News* was to undermine confidence in the official statements touching military

³⁹ *The Proper Relationship between the Army and the Press in War* (Army War College pamphlet, Washington, November, 1915), p. 5. Davis's Macon speech appeared in the *Macon Telegraph and Confederate*, September 24, 1864, and was copied in the *Philadelphia Inquirer* of October 8. See also C. A. Dana and J. H. Wilson, *Life of U. S. Grant* (1868), p. 314.

matters which emanated from Washington. Secretary Stanton's reports regarding the operations around Richmond in 1864 were discounted and represented as deliberate falsifications.

It is enough to make me shudder [wrote their Washington correspondent], to read the flaming bulletins of victory that Mr. Stanton has recently telegraphed from here. Is the public to be regarded as thoughtless children . . . that they can be made to believe in victories like these? . . . Is it so long since the great and bloody victories of Grant over Lee, all the way from the Rapidan to Richmond, in each of which the rebel army was annihilated? When the public remembers the glowing accounts of these victories, and how much was promised on account of them, and when they see now that they were of no account at all as affecting the general result of the war, they may be pardoned for incredulity about . . . present victories. [And again] The country is favored with a repetition of the stale report that the rebel army is broken up, and its efficiency destroyed, but the people are not gullible enough to be deceived by it.⁴⁰

Such utterances lead us to conclude that among newspaper "disclosures" at the North we should include the disclosure of editorial disappointment at Union success.

In considering the remedies for newspaper abuses which were available during the Civil War, it should be noted in the first place that correspondents accompanying an army were within the range of military law, and were liable to discipline by court martial.⁴¹ The general principle that camp followers or army retainers were subject to military jurisdiction would perhaps have sufficed to cover the case of news-writers, and in addition there was a clear provision in the fifty-seventh Article of War⁴² against "holding correspondence with, or giving intelligence to, the enemy, either directly or indirectly". Offenders under this article were to suffer death "or such other punishment as shall be ordered by the sentence of a court martial". As an amplification of this article a general order of the War Department was issued, declaring that all correspondence, verbal or in writing, printing or telegraphing, concerning military operations or movements on land or water, or regarding troops, camps, arsenals, intrenchments or military affairs within the several military districts, by which intelligence might be given to the enemy, without the sanction of the general in command, was prohibited, and that violators should be proceeded against under the fifty-seventh

⁴⁰ *New York Daily News*, December 20, 1864.

⁴¹ *Offic. Rec.*, first series, vol. XLII., pt. 3, p. 706; *Digest of the Opinions of the Judge Advocates General*, p. 1082; E. S. Dudley, *Military Law and the Procedure of Courts Martial* (second ed., New York, 1908), p. 375.

⁴² An Act for Establishing Rules and Articles for the Government of the Armies of the United States, approved April 10, 1806. *Statutes at Large*, II. 359.

Article of War.⁴³ It was understood that war correspondents as a class were so far under the authority of the commanding general of the army which they accompanied that he might issue rules and regulations to govern their conduct. As in all wars, intercourse with the enemy was interdicted, except under flags of truce or on the basis of special executive permits. A system of correspondence maintained between Northern and Southern papers by means of publications entitled "Personals" was held to be illegal as an evasion of this rule.⁴⁴ Editors might be subjected to summary arrest for disloyalty or under the elastic charge of "resisting the draft", and other methods were available such as excluding correspondents from the lines, withholding facilities for news-gathering, denying the privilege of the mails, prohibiting the circulation of papers, seizing an edition, and, in extreme cases, suppressing the paper.

In a number of instances newspaper correspondents were disciplined by the military authorities.⁴⁵ This discipline usually amounted to exclusion from the lines of a military command. General Canby, in 1864, found it necessary to order the dismissal of two reporters, representing the New York *Herald* and *Tribune*,⁴⁶ because they had disclosed military secrets, and had engaged in a controversy calculated to disturb the harmony of his troops. Grant arrested and dismissed the *Tribune* correspondent whose "false and slanderous" copy had misrepresented Hancock's movements near Petersburg in June, 1864. After the battle of the Wilderness a Cincinnati paper published the untrue statement that Meade had counselled retreat. Under Meade's order the offending correspondent was appropriately placarded and paraded through the lines, and afterward expelled from the army.⁴⁷ Sherman in 1861, finding his operations in Kentucky greatly embarrassed by the publication of his movements in the press, banished every newspaper correspondent from the lines, and promised summary punishment to all who should in the future give information concerning his position, strength, or movements.⁴⁸

Another instance of the more or less constant friction between Sherman and the correspondents occurred early in 1863 during the operations near Vicksburg. A *Herald* writer, T. W. Knox, having

⁴³ *Offic. Rec.*, first series, vol. XLI., pt. 2, p. 778.

⁴⁴ *Digest of Opinions of Judge Advocates General*, p. 1056.

⁴⁵ Winthrop, *Military Law and Procedure* (second ed.), I. 133, note 4.

⁴⁶ *Offic. Rec.*, first series, vol. XLI., pt. 2, p. 778.

⁴⁷ Dana, *Recollections of the Civil War*, p. 215.

⁴⁸ S. M. Bowman, *Sherman and his Campaigns* (New York, 1865), pp. 447-448.

entered the lines in violation of Sherman's order, wrote back offensive criticisms of the general to his paper. Sherman, anxious "to establish the principle that citizens shall not, against the orders of the competent military superior, attend a military expedition, report its proceedings, and comment on its officers", took up the case vigorously. He caused Knox's communication to be read to him paragraph by paragraph, showed him the instructions and orders covering the point, and then had him excluded from the Union lines on order of Grant, commander of the department. An appeal was made to the President, but Lincoln declined to act over the head of General Grant and Knox was not readmitted into the lines.⁴⁹ In these instances one glimpses the constant friction between the army and the press, but so utterly lax was the treatment of war correspondents that these few cases of discipline had, after all, but slight effect upon the whole problem of news control.

Action against newspapers in the civil courts yielded no results. In the first place, the whole genius of American law is opposed to the prosecution of journalists for such utterances in their papers as constitute offenses against the government. Editors and proprietors of papers were, indeed, legally responsible for what their sheets contained, but this responsibility could only be made effective by the vote of a jury in an action for libel. It would appear that personal abuse, as for instance the public slandering of a general, would come under the law of libel, but even so the public interest involved obtains no recognition. Moreover, a libel suit is, in practice, usually found to be an inadequate remedy, and American law may be considered both defective and uncertain in the enforcement of responsibility of newspapers. Such laws as we now have requiring the registration of the owners, managers, and editors of publications were not in existence during the Civil War, and it was an easy matter to conceal the actual ownership and responsible management of a newspaper.⁵⁰ When abuse of the government was in question, there seemed to be no adequate way of securing action by judicial process against offending journals. There was, it is true, a law which severely punished anyone who resisted the draft or counselled resistance,⁵¹ and the Treason Act of July 17, 1862

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 447-452; *The Sherman Letters*, pp. 187-188.

⁵⁰ The facts in the libel suit of *Opdyke v. Marble* revealed a studied effort to conceal the real ownership of the *New York World*. *New York Daily News*, October 6, 1864.

⁵¹ For resisting the draft, John Mullaly, editor and proprietor of the *Metropolitan Record*, New York, was prosecuted under the act of February 29, 1864, but was discharged on the ground that the draft had not gone into actual operation. In announcing his opinion, U. S. Commissioner Osborn upheld the right of citizens to criticize governmental measures. *New York World*, August 29, 1864.

(i. e., the second confiscation act), was sufficiently comprehensive to include those who gave aid and comfort to the enemy through the expression of disloyal sentiments. The occasional grand jury indictments against editors, however, brought no results, as none of the cases reached the point of a judicial conviction. In view of this fact, it is hard to agree that the ordinary resources of the law were adequate to deal with journalistic treason.

There is no "seditious libel" law here as in England for punishing extreme abuse of the government, and there is no normal way for the federal government to take the initiative in a prosecution. So effective has been the provision of the first constitutional amendment against laws to abridge the freedom of the press that Congress has only once ventured to restrict editorial independence, and the sedition law of 1798 raised such a storm of denunciation that it was not generally enforced. Had it not expired in 1801 it would certainly have been repealed. In 1832 the law was denounced as unconstitutional by the House Judiciary Committee, and Congress in 1840 indicated its disapproval of the act by refunding a fine that had been imposed upon the Vermont editor Matthew Lyon.⁵²

Considering these limitations upon judicial and legislative action, it became necessary for the Executive to resort to extraordinary constitutional grounds and to the plea of military necessity whenever newspaper abuse reached such a pass as to call for really vigorous action. Though the arrest of editors and the suppression of papers would have been appropriate under a régime of martial law, or in a district under military occupation, yet such action under the actual circumstances was hard to justify, except on the principle that the supremacy of the government was an imperative necessity. The protection under the Indemnity Act of officers who acted under the President's orders amounted to a recognition of the unusual character of these proceedings.

The difficulty of enforcing such measures was well illustrated in the case of the suppression of the New York *World* in May, 1864. The *World* had published on May 18, in company with other papers, a bogus proclamation of the President which implied an admission of Union disaster in recent military operations, set a day for fasting, and called for a draft of 400,000 men. General Dix, under orders from Washington, seized the offices of the *World* and *Journal of Commerce*, and their publication was suspended for three days. The editors protested against this measure

⁵² Report of Judiciary Com., House of Representatives, January 20, 1832, *House Report No. 218*, 22 Cong., 1 sess. Act approved July 4, 1840, *Statutes at Large*, VI. 802.

of military repression in a district not under martial law, and a chorus of indignant denunciation of the act arose in the editorial columns of other newspapers in New York and elsewhere. Proceedings in the city court were instituted against General Dix, and Governor Seymour intervened to have these proceedings pushed. Here was an interesting conflict between state and federal authority, an attempt by a state to hold a high officer of the nation to judicial accountability for what was regarded as a usurpation and an infringement upon private rights. The order of the President, however, was pleaded by the defendant and the case never resulted in a conviction. So strong was the opposition to the suppression that the precedent could hardly be regarded as a fortunate one to follow. When, on resuming publication, the *World* issued a "triple sheet" giving a long detailed account of the affair, which proved to be an excellent "story", the lively demand for copies indicated that the paper had suffered no loss of prestige, and the net result of the incident was to discourage similar attacks upon the press in the future.⁵³

The Chicago *Times* was "suppressed" in 1863 by an unprompted order of General Burnside, the publication of one issue being prevented, but this order was regretted by every member of the Cabinet, according to Gideon Welles, and was immediately revoked by President Lincoln. Senator Trumbull spoke earnestly against this measure, and the Illinois House of Representatives denounced the action as a case of military despotism and an invasion of the sovereignty of the state.⁵⁴

One of the prominent arrests was that of F. Key Howard, editor and proprietor of the Baltimore *Exchange*, which was open in its expression of sympathy for the cause of secession. With other Baltimore editors Howard was seized and placed in confinement with the "prisoners of state" in Fort Lafayette. He assumed the rôle of a martyr to the cause of constitutional liberty and sent a vigorous letter to the Secretary of War demanding instant and unconditional release. Pardon would not satisfy him; he refused to appear before an "irresponsible tribunal", and would not accept a discharge upon the condition of foregoing or concealing his opinions.⁵⁵ After some months of confinement he was released by order of the War Department.

On the morrow of Howard's arrest the *Exchange* declared in an indignant editorial that the unrestricted right of the press to dis-

⁵³ Welles, *Diary*, II. 67; New York *World*, May-July, 1864, *passim*.

⁵⁴ Welles, *Diary*, I. 321; Horace White, *Life of Lyman Trumbull*, p. 208; *Offic. Rec.*, second series, V. 724.

⁵⁵ *Offic. Rec.*, second series, II. 781, 783.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXIII.—21.

cuss and condemn the war policy of the government is identical with the freedom of the people to do the same thing, and continued to express its disapproval of the war. The attack upon the paper caused it to gain rather than lose in the popular estimation.⁵⁶

A study of the various instances of governmental repression in the case of newspapers will reveal not so much that the penalties were excessive in view of the offense committed as that the means were ill adapted to the end desired. Popular pressure, rather than governmental repression was, after all, the most effective method by which the journals could be kept within bounds. The press of the country is in any case but the reflection of sentiment, and where the sentiment was hostile to the administration any interference with its written expression could have no other effect than to intensify resentment and bring popular sympathy to bear upon persecuted editors. It is the old story of the absolute inability of government to force or supplant sentiment.

There were many in the North, however, who waxed indignant at the thought that while their sons were fighting for the cause of the Union, editors should be unmolested in furnishing to the enemy by their pens a form of aid and comfort which was more effective than guns and ammunition. This popular resentment found expression in numerous attacks upon such papers as were tainted with disloyalty. Editors were worried, threatened, banished, or subjected to personal outrage; newspaper offices were frequently attacked by mobs so that guards were needed to protect property; in some instances papers were destroyed, and other forms of opposition were resorted to.⁵⁷ Officers of the government received numerous petitions directed against disaffected journalists, and such expressions of loyal indignation more than outnumbered remonstrances against interference with journalistic freedom. It may be said that the government did far less than the enthusiastic Union men of the time would have wished in the way of controlling the press. Zealously loyal men had to be disappointed while policy was so trimmed as to avoid offending conservative sentiment.

Viewing the whole period of the war, and taking account of all parts of the country, it appears that the actual governmental inter-

⁵⁶ Baltimore *Exchange*, editorial, September 13, 1861. Other Baltimore papers were summarily dealt with. The *South* was suppressed on February 17, 1862, and the *Maryland News Sheet* on August 14. The *Gazette* (the *News Sheet* under a new name) was suspended from September 28 to October 7, 1863, and the *Daily Baltimore Republican* was suppressed on September 11, 1863. *Check List of American Newspapers*, Library of Congress, pp. 81 ff.

⁵⁷ An interesting summary of incidents showing popular violence against newspapers and editors is to be found in the *Annual Cyclopaedia*, 1864, p. 393.

ference with the freedom of the press was comparatively slight, and that voluntary restraint or popular pressure had far greater effect in keeping improper material out of newspapers than official repression. Just as the deep-laid schemes of the conspiracy known as the "Order of American Knights", with its elaborate plans for a Northern uprising in support of the Confederacy, failed without governmental prosecution, so the administration survived the attacks and errors of hostile or indiscreet journalists. There was during the war no real suppression of opinion.

JAMES G. RANDALL.

THE END OF THE ALLIANCE OF THE EMPERORS¹

I.

AFTER having triumphed over two great powers, Austria and France, in the campaigns of 1866 and 1870, Germany in 1879 expected to see them contract alliances intended to revenge themselves for the defeats which they had suffered at her hands. This apprehension occupied in the strongest manner the mind of Prince Bismarck, who, according to Count Peter Shuvalov, Russian ambassador in London, saw on all sides coalitions plotted against Germany. To preserve the empire from all danger, the chancellor deemed it necessary to conclude at least a defensive alliance with one power. He must make his choice between Austria and Russia. An alliance with the latter would, in his judgment, be more solid and more durable, because of the bonds of friendship which for many years had united the two imperial courts, of the monarchical sentiments which were dominant in both empires, and of the absence in Russia of those heterogeneous elements that work upon public opinion in Hungarian, Slavic, or Catholic circles in the Danubian monarchy. Yet despite all the advantages of an alliance with Russia, Bismarck preferred to turn toward Austria-Hungary, for if Germany should join herself to the empire of the tsars, she would more or less sacrifice her relations with the other powers, and would, in the case of a conflict with Austria and France, incur the danger of finding herself, by reason of her geographical situation, at the mercy of Russia. The latter power, placed at the extreme east of Europe, always had the means of escaping from attack. A treaty of alliance between Germany and Austria-Hungary was signed at Vienna on October 7, 1879; it was an arrangement purely defensive, in the case of aggression on the part of Russia or of any other power against either one of the contracting parties.

But the chancellor himself had no confidence in the stability and continuance of the alliance with Austria. Uneasy as to the fate of the provinces taken away from France, he sought for the most

¹ Revolutionary events having laid open the archives of the Russian Foreign Office to the use of scholars, down to dates much later than have hitherto been customary, Mr. Serge Goriainov, formerly archivist of that ministry, and afterward senator, has prepared for the *American Historical Review*, from materials found in those archives, the following article.

suitable means of safeguarding Germany against every conflict with her western neighbor. In truth, the Austro-German treaty did not prevent France from allying herself with Russia against Germany. It was necessary to forestall such an alliance, to secure from Russia that she should remain neutral in case of attack upon Germany or Austria. An agreement between the three emperors was arranged, and the document embodying it was signed on June 6/18, 1881, by Saburov, Bismarck, and Széchenyi.

The first article of this treaty was thus expressed :

In case one of the three powers should find itself at war with a fourth great power, the other two will preserve a benevolent neutrality toward it, and will devote their efforts to the localizing of the conflict.

This stipulation shall also apply to a war between one of the three powers and Turkey, but only in case a previous agreement has been arranged between the three courts relative to the results of that war.

In the special case that one of them shall have obtained from one of its two allies a more positive assistance, the obligation of the present article shall continue in full force for the third.

This agreement was concluded for a period of three years. Well in advance of its expiration, the minister of foreign affairs called together a council at Moscow, on May 20, 1883, to deliberate on the question whether reasons of state required a renewal of this treaty. Mr. Peter Saburov, ambassador of Russia at Berlin, held that this *entente* was more advantageous to Germany than to Russia. Three years before, it was sufficient for the needs of the moment; now, it was no longer capable of securing Russian interests. The first article, while leaving to Germany entire freedom of action in the West, conditioned all action in the East upon a previous agreement with Germany and Austria. For this reason, a renewal of the treaty ought not to be brought about except upon the basis of a perfect equality between the advantages secured to Russia and those secured to Germany, or upon the condition of giving both powers entire freedom, the one in the East, the other in the West, or, at any rate, of making that freedom conditional, in both cases, upon previous accord.

Of these two alternatives, the first seemed more advantageous to Russia, as leaving full liberty of action on both sides. In the case of a disintegration of Turkey, the occupation of the Straits was for us a vital question, the answer to which would have been greatly facilitated by our having procured in advance the assent of Germany and Austria to our acting according to our own desires in the Orient. A complete neutrality on the part of these powers would guarantee us against a European coalition and would isolate England, which would never yield to us the Straits.

The other high officials who took part in the deliberations, Giers, Count Miliutin, Prince Lobanov-Rostovski, while recognizing the force of Saburov's comments, were of the opinion that Bismarck would never consent to the modifications which he proposed.

In a memoir dated in December, 1883, Baron Jomini, first counsellor to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, set forth the arguments for renewing the treaty of 1881 for three years, without any modifications. In his view the programme worked out at Livadia in 1879 was a preparation for arriving at our sole objective—Constantinople and the Straits—by the following means: (1) the restoration of financial equilibrium by the retiring of fifty million rubles of bank-notes per annum; (2) the creation of a fleet in the Black Sea; (3) an understanding with our neighbors to make sure of their neutrality. Now as notes to the amount of more than four hundred millions of rubles had been emitted for the last war, we should, if we retired fifty millions per annum, need eight or ten years to re-establish our currency. The creation of an adequate fleet would call for still more time. The result would be that if we should at this time conclude an arrangement with Germany based on a full liberty of action toward France on her part, in exchange for a full liberty of action on our part at Constantinople and in the Dardanelles, Germany would be obtaining an immediate advantage and would be giving us nothing more than an assurance which we could realize only at the end of some fifteen years. It was beyond all question that as soon as Bismarck had assured himself of our neutrality, he would seize the first occasion to finish with France. Without sufficient funds for war and without a fleet, should we be able at that same time to finish with Constantinople and the Straits, in face of England's opposition? And if we could not do it simultaneously, could we reckon upon it that Germany, freed from all fear on the side of France and become all-powerful in Europe, would at any later time aid us in good faith to realize our Oriental programme? If on the other hand we contented ourselves with renewing our arrangements for three years, we should be gaining time, indispensable for our preparations, and we should be fortifying the *status quo*, because Germany, reassured for the moment, would have less reason to precipitate a decisive conflict with France, on which the Emperor William would probably not resolve except in case of absolute necessity; because France, knowing that she could not count on us, would be less disposed to embark upon the terrible adventure of *revanche*; and finally because, since the triple *entente* was based on the maintenance of the Treaty of Berlin, the joint action of the

three courts would be able to prevent any violent shocks of a sort likely to bring on the collapse of Turkey.

About this same time Giers, while travelling from Petrograd to Montreux, stopped at Berlin, where he was very graciously received by the Emperor William and the Crown Prince Frederick. He did not fail to go to Friedrichsruhe and see the chancellor. His impressions of this visit are set down in a letter which he wrote from Montreux on November 7/19, 1883, to his assistant Vlangali:

Bismarck came to meet me at the railroad station, and took me in his carriage to his house, where I was served to luncheon. Arriving at two o'clock, I left Friedrichsruhe at 10 P. M., to spend the night at Hamburg. I began my conversation with the chancellor by telling him of the agreeable impression I had received from my audience with the emperor. "Yes", said he, "one could not sufficiently pray the good God to prolong the days of our venerable sovereign. One can have full confidence in him, and as for me I entirely share his sentiments toward Russia, and his desire to keep up relations of friendship with her. In this I fulfil faithfully my duty toward him." Then Bismarck endeavored to demonstrate to me that during his whole political career he had constantly favored alliance with Russia, though on our side he had not always been rightly understood. He dwelt long on this idea, that it would have been very useful for us to have an understanding with Austria to determine the sphere of our influence in the Balkans. I remarked that the formal delimitation of spheres of influence was quite difficult to achieve; thus, we could not give up either Montenegro or Servia to the exclusive influence of Vienna. Bismarck showed himself entirely ready to enter into negotiations for the renewal of the agreement of the three emperors. From Saburov's explanations, he had drawn the conclusion that we wished to enlarge its scope, to go back to the propositions advanced at Reichstadt, and to take up the questions connected with the fall of the Ottoman Empire. "The problem is very difficult", said he, "but all the same we had resolved, Count Kalnóky and I, to listen to your proposals." "Very difficult, indeed", I replied, "and in fact not very suitable, since we mean to maintain friendly relations with the sultan, but it would be better not to go too fast, and for the moment simply to renew the treaty, making any needed alterations." Bismarck undertook to prove to me the great utility of a *rapprochement*, and even of a close alliance between the three emperors. He said that he would have been ready to propose outright an offensive and defensive alliance between them. It was true that, in view of present circumstances, it could not call itself a Holy Alliance, but nevertheless it would be quite as profitable to Europe as that one, by maintaining peace for many years. This proposition surprised me not a little; I did not consider myself authorized to accept it; moreover its value to Russia, in the actual state of European affairs, seemed to be in truth quite doubtful; therefore I did not dwell upon it, but observed to the chancellor that the situation in the three empires did not appear to me very favorable for attaining such a result.

I then proposed to him that certain corrections should be made in the text of the treaty, among others the omission of the third paragraph

of the first article, which appeared to me entirely useless and which set up a certain inequality between the contracting parties. Bismarck understood me at once. He proceeded immediately to assure me that this paragraph was useful to us, for, in case Russia should ally herself with Austria in a war against Turkey, Germany would be under obligation to hold back England; but when I said to him that such an eventuality would certainly not come about soon and that one might much more probably expect that Germany in alliance with Austria and perhaps with Italy should attack France, he accepted my proposal and promised me that he would uphold it at Vienna.

In the course of the conversation Bismarck declared to Giers that he would abandon his political career after the death of the Emperor William, for the Crown Prince was an admirer of Gladstone, whose system was in no wise suitable to Germany. "Everything will go to pieces then", said Bismarck. This idea pursued him and he was endeavoring to consolidate as firmly as possible the structure he had reared. In Bismarck's opinion the friendship of Russia was one of the guarantees of the existence of the German Empire. The chancellor considered the *entente* with Russia as of more importance than all of the alliances with Austria and Italy. In view of these sentiments of the chancellor toward Russia, Giers sought to be agreeable to him by saying that the Emperor Alexander relied on him to tighten the bonds of friendship between the two empires and to maintain peace. These words pleased the chancellor very much. "I beg you", said he, "to lay me at the feet of his Majesty with the expression of my profound gratitude for his confidence in me and to assure him that I shall use every endeavor to be worthy of it; after the interests of Germany, it is those of the Emperor Alexander that I shall serve the most faithfully."

On his return, Giers stopped at Vienna, where he was received by the Emperor Francis Joseph and had an interview with Count Kalnóky. The visits he had paid to Berlin and to Vienna contributed to the success of the negotiations for the renewal of the alliance of the three emperors. The entire negotiation was confided to Prince Orlov, who was appointed ambassador at Berlin in place of Saburov. The instruction which he received on February 8, 1884, declared that the emperor, persevering in the pacific policy he had announced, desired to keep up relations of friendship with Germany; yet he would have preferred to have his action free from every engagement, that he might use it according to his own conviction with a view to general peace and the interests of Russia. But, under present circumstances, a refusal to renew the previous arrangements or a proposal to restrict their continuance to too short a term, would have aroused distrust, or perhaps even have led to

political combinations which it was important to avoid in order to maintain the pacific understanding between the three imperial courts. That understanding was more indispensable than ever, in order to strengthen the principle of monarchical order in face of the increasing peril of social revolution. This common feeling was the bond which should unite sovereigns and governments in a strict solidarity. But good intentions and fair words would not be sufficient, if they were not translated into facts.

Under this view, the emperor had received with satisfaction two practical assurances that had been given to M. de Giers, the one by Prince Bismarck, the other by Count Kalnóky. The first was that the German chancellor was firmly resolved to preserve peace with France and avoid every provocation, even in case of restoration of the Orleans dynasty, provided that restoration were not brought about upon the programme of a war of revenge. The second was that Count Kalnóky did not intend to press for an extension of the political action of Austria in the Balkan peninsula, nor even to bring about immediately a definitive and formal annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. France had at Berlin, in Prince Orlov, a sincere friend, and at need, a warm advocate. Undoubtedly the emperor would not have encouraged France to incur the risks attendant upon a rupture with Germany; France, in the situation in which she then stood, could not even be considered as an element in our political calculations. But the emperor would not have wished to see her disappear from the European scene under the blows of Germany or in the convulsions of anarchy. To have a monarchical, strong, and prosperous France would have been for our interest and would have made for the normal equilibrium of Europe; it might have been one more guarantee of general peace and social order. For the moment, the essential end of his Majesty's policy was to obtain several years of calm in the *status quo*; and the advanced age of the Emperor William made this a possibility. What was requisite was to eliminate those external and unforeseen causes which might interrupt this state of things; a renewal of the triple *entente* might contribute to this, on the one side by contenting France, on the other side by reassuring Germany. It was this thought that inspired his Majesty's determination. The triple *entente* was renewed for three years with some modifications in the text of the treaty, among them the excision of the third paragraph of the first article. The act was signed at Berlin on March 15/27, 1884, by Orlov, Bismarck, and Széchenyi.

II.

In his annual report for 1887, the Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs declared that Russia, in putting herself into accord with Germany and Austria in 1881, had had in view the maintenance of the general peace, which Russia needed after the war which had exhausted her. It was certain that the general peace would be more firmly assured by an *entente* of the three emperors than by a separate alliance of two of them. Such were the considerations which had determined the late emperor to enter into this pacific triple *entente*. But the turn of events in the Balkan peninsula brought out an irreconcilable antagonism between us and Austria. In vain did we, at each renewal of the triple *entente*, exert ourselves to remove the causes of conflict; the result was, definitely, that Austria had entered, without striking a blow, into full possession of the provinces which she had wrested from Turkey, and from them was dominating Serbia and crushing Montenegro, while Russia saw the influence she had so dearly acquired in Bulgaria destroyed by foreign intrigues in which Austria had certainly had a large part. Such results made a disturbing impression upon Russian public opinion. And since under the triple *entente* Austrian policy clearly rested upon the alliance with Germany, the latter was in our country involved in the same disapproval which was visited upon Austria. The Berlin cabinet was accused of bad faith and duplicity; the organs of the Russian press set forth with approval the idea of opposing, to an alliance which had been weakened by want of confidence in the two neighboring empires, a close *rapprochement* with France based upon community of interests. The French press naturally seized upon this situation, and the turbulent elements in France exploited it passionately, to further their plans of *revanche*. The violence of this unrestrained polemic, disturbing the German mind, reacted ultimately upon the governments, and the tension of their states of opinion was shown by a series of military, financial, and economic measures which could not fail to poison their mutual relations. In the presence of such a state of affairs, the tsar deemed it no longer possible to renew the agreement of the three emperors, the pacific purpose of which could no longer be achieved. In fact at the beginning of the year 1887, a bill was introduced in the Reichstag according to the terms of which the strength of the German imperial army on a peace footing would be raised from 427,000 men to 468,000, for the period of the next seven years. In the session of January 11, 1887, Bismarck, going into the tribune himself to support the bill, said:

Not one voice in France has renounced Alsace-Lorraine; at any moment a government may be established which will declare war. It may break out in ten days as readily as in ten years; nothing can be answered for. The war of 1870 was but child's play in comparison with the future war; on both sides an effort will be made to finish the adversary, to bleed him white, that the vanquished may not be able to rise again, and may never, for thirty years, dare even to think of the possibility of turning against the conqueror.

The Reichstag consented to increase the army for only three years instead of seven; it was dissolved, with a view to a new election.

This menacing language of Prince Bismarck and the armament of Italy, Switzerland, and Belgium alarmed France, which, on its side, proceeded to construct cantonments along its frontier, for shelter to the reservists in case they were called, and began a reorganization of its army in accordance with the plans of General Boulanger, minister of war. In a conversation with Baron Mohrenheim, ambassador of Russia, Flourens, who then had charge of foreign affairs, set forth the necessity for France to hold herself ready on short notice, while at the same time he scrupulously avoided giving any handle to false imputation of warlike designs; he repudiated all such in emphatic terms, sincerely and absolutely desiring, and intending, nothing but peace. France would not attack Germany unless the latter were strongly engaged elsewhere.

In reporting this conversation, Mohrenheim remarked that the government of the Republic sought for the moral support of Russia in case Germany should demand disarmament on the part of France. On reading this despatch, the Emperor Alexander III. noted on the margin that in such case France could count upon the moral support of Russia. M. de Giers, on his part, wrote to Mohrenheim, January 22, 1887, that the apprehensions of Flourens, as to aggressive intentions on the part of Bismarck, were exaggerated, for the latter had many times given assurances that Germany would not attack France. The declaration of Flourens that France would not declare war on Germany unless the latter was strongly engaged elsewhere, was worthy of attention; if that were the case the chances for maintaining peace appeared far from being exhausted; and as peace was for the interest of all governments, it could not logically be contrary to their intentions. In M. de Giers's view, of all the causes that might embitter the relations between Germany and France, one of the most potent would be the suspicion of an agreement between France and Russia inimical to Germany, for a strict friendship between Russia and Germany was the firmest security for

France as for all Europe. M. de Mohrenheim was to convey these views to Flourens, assuring him that an *entente* between France and Russia would certainly embitter relations between Germany and France.

The government of the Republic was entirely aware of the cogent reasons in favor of a good understanding between Russia and Germany, and accepted the view that Bismarck, if secure of good relations with Russia, would exert all his efforts to assure to the empire he had created a peaceful development. Eminently desirous to please the Russian ambassador and to defer to his advice, the French cabinet sought a sure means of consulting the imperial cabinet in great secrecy, through a confidential person, sent for that special purpose. The tsar minuted upon Mohrenheim's telegram on this subject the words, "This might be very useful to us, in certain contingencies [*à un moment donné*], and we ought not to discourage them". The person chosen for the purpose was Count Melchior de Vogüé. But Baron Mohrenheim did not deem it necessary at that time to have recourse to this intermediary.

In the course of that same year the secret treaty of the three emperors was to expire. The triple agreement was the basis of the ministerial policy of Giers. Voices were raised in Russia in criticism of it, and in denunciation of it as harmful to Russian interests. Several diplomats, such as Count Ignatiev, Saburov, Tatishchev, and others, won over to their side the publicist Katkov, who undertook a bitter campaign against the minister of foreign affairs. Giers nevertheless was able to obtain the emperor's approval. In a letter of November, 1886, to Count Shuvalov, ambassador in Berlin, he wrote that his Majesty continued to attach value to the understanding with Germany, but that the emperor wished that it should be serious, sincere, and complete. On his part Shuvalov, while appreciating the traditional friendship of the courts of Prussia and Russia and the advantages which our country might derive from it, observed that one did not need to be a great politician to convince himself of the immense profit it was to Germany to be united to us in a strong and durable manner, for the assurances of support, or rather of neutrality, with respect to Bulgaria, which Germany bestowed upon us in abundant measure, cost her very little. In spite of all the outcries in the delegations at Pesth, the Berlin cabinet knew very well that Austria would not dare to undertake anything against us, that she would not go beyond platonic protestations. Germany risked nothing in declaring to us that Austria could not reckon upon her aid nor even upon her moral support. But was it not necessary to

think of other eventualities—by hypothesis, that we should be forced, in spite of ourselves, to be embroiled with Austria? For such a case, Shuvalov asks, if the triple alliance should proceed to crumble, might it not be replaced by some dual arrangement effected before the explosion should take place? Would it not be possible to obtain some understanding that in these conditions would guarantee us on the side of Austria and her probable allies? At the moment there was in existence a triple agreement and also another alongside it, based on interests common to our two allies. Shuvalov questions whether a third might not be brought into existence, between Germany and ourselves, based on interests concerning us especially; *do ut des*. The chancellor, having no other thought and desire than the securing of general peace, could hardly refuse combinations which alone could secure him that result.

To this question of Shuvalov, Giers replied, September 14, that the idea of substituting a dual alliance for the triple alliance was a very good one, and was in all points agreeable to the tsar's desire, which was to strengthen in permanent shape our understanding with Germany. But how bring this about? At the beginning of the negotiations which had resulted in the signing of our secret arrangements of 1881, our intention had been to make them with Germany alone. Our object was to guard ourselves against the danger of the coalitions which the complicated execution of the treaty of Berlin threatened at every instant to raise against Russia, and to deprive Great Britain, particularly aggressive at that time, of every ally in case she should decide to make war upon us. On the other hand it was important to us to cause Germany to share our point of view respecting the principle of the closing of the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles and to lead her to enforce at Constantinople respect for the treaties in which that principle had been embodied.

Germany on her side asked that we should assure her of our neutrality and of the limitation of the conflict in case she should find herself at war with France, and that we should respect the integrity of Austria, provided the latter did not extend her action into the Orient beyond the limits indicated by the treaty of Berlin, unless on previous arrangement with us.

Such had been, on one side and on the other, the fundamental bases of Saburov's negotiations. But Bismarck had speedily declared that it would be difficult for him to enter into the proposed engagements without associating Austria in them, bound as he was to Austria by previous arrangements. The chancellor moreover considered the participation of Vienna in our treaty as very desir-

able, with a view toward emphasizing the powerful agreement of the three empires in the face of the republican and anarchical tendencies which were devastating the rest of Europe, and also toward reducing the chance that Austria, left at one side and entirely free, should seek, on some turn of events, either to join Great Britain against us or to join France against Germany. This last conjunction was not likely, but it was quite possible that at the least complication Austria should seek alliance with Great Britain against us. Since, moreover, Bismarck had declared that in case of war between Russia and Austria he could not go beyond seeing to it that neither one of the two belligerents was mortally wounded, and since, for our part, we could perceive no chance of war between Austria and Germany, the establishment of a triple *entente* was plainly indicated by the political necessities of the moment.

Undoubtedly this *entente* would be the best guarantee of peace, which Russia needed, especially with regard to her future development. The cabinet of Vienna, directed at this time by Baron Haymerle, had much hesitation in taking part in the alliance which we were preparing to negotiate with Germany. It would have preferred to remain outside, free from any engagement with us. When finally she consented to take part in our engagements, her attention naturally fell especially upon the article framed to guarantee the advantages secured to Austria by the treaty of Berlin, such as the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the clause relating to the sanjak of Novi-Bazar. In order to make the stipulations of this article more precise, it was agreed that a protocol should be joined to the treaty, setting forth the special questions on which agreement had been reached.

But the events which had occurred in Bulgaria in the course of 1886, of which a prince protected by Austria had availed himself to seize power in despite of the treaty of Berlin, without the assent of the other great powers, were not of a nature to encourage the least step toward *rapprochement* between Austria and Russia. Accordingly M. de Giers recommended Shuvalov to consider carefully the idea of an arrangement with Germany alone, which should have as its objects: (1) to surround the maintenance of peace with solid guarantees, indispensable to the development of our military, naval, and financial strength, and to guard us against the danger of European coalitions by sincere and firm alliance with the most powerful of the neighboring states, whose influence was at present decisive in most questions arising in Europe and even in the Orient; (2) to prevent any arbitrary alteration of the territorial *status quo*

in the Balkan peninsula and to cause it to be recognized that a preponderant influence on our part in the two Bulgarias was legitimate; (3) to guarantee as far as possible the inviolability of the Straits by assuring us of the firm support of Germany in proclaiming in decided terms, and in case of need enforcing, respect for this principle on the part of Turkey and of all powers signatory to the treaties in which it had been embodied.

In the first conference, on May 11, 1887, Shuvalov broached to Bismarck the question of a dual agreement. He reminded the chancellor of the words which the latter had spoken some time before. "If France attacks us, we shall do our part to defend ourselves, but we shall not precipitate ourselves against the French fortified lines." The principal object of Germany was, then, to guard herself against aggression on the part of France, relying upon our benevolent neutrality in the case of a war of revenge. Such was Bismarck's understanding; he said:

In case of aggression on the part of France we have your benevolent neutrality. You have ours in the case of a war with any third power, Great Britain, Turkey, Austria. The case of a war between you and Austria is one that would embarrass me extremely because of certain engagements which bind us to that power. What will you have? They are of such a sort that they do not permit us to accept without reservation your first article, in the form which you have given to it.²

With these words, the chancellor took out of his portfolio the secret convention of 1879 between Germany and Austria, renewed in 1884 for five years, and read it in German to Shuvalov, who then for the first time had knowledge of it, and learned positively that it was directed solely against an attack by Russia. Bismarck declared to Shuvalov that he sincerely regretted that the events of 1879 had compelled him to protect himself against us by means of this arrangement, but it nevertheless existed, and it would be disloyal toward us for him to accept the first article of our proposed convention, in view of the disclosure he had just made. Could we not, said he, add to article first the following words: "with the exception of the contingency provided for in the treaty subsisting between Germany and Austria, in case the latter should be attacked by Russia".

Shuvalov replied that such a condition reversed the meaning of the whole article; and moreover, if unexpected complications in the Balkan peninsula should arise to affect our relations with Austria, a difficulty would at once present itself, namely, the difficulty of deciding on which side the aggression lay. In subsequent confer-

² For the first part of the first article, see below, p. 338.

ences the first article was subjected to further changes. Bismarck proposed to add the phrase, "saving the obligations arising to Germany from a defensive treaty existing between her and Austria". It appeared to Shuvalov that this version might be accepted, with the reservation that Germany should equally take account of the Emperor Alexander's desire to promise his benevolent neutrality in case of war between Germany and France in which the former should be the aggressor. He proposed to add the words, "and saving also, for Russia, the case of an attack on France by Germany".

This proposal of Shuvalov was displeasing to Bismarck. He exclaimed with much disappointment that nothing justified such an addition, that if there was any need to speak of certain obligations resting on Germany, it was because they flowed from a regular treaty, while we were not bound to France by any document, and, finally, that the treaty subsisting between Germany and Austria was purely defensive and, in a way, guaranteed France against any aggression on the part of Germany. Shuvalov endeavored to calm the chancellor's irritation by assuring him that no ulterior designs were cherished by us, that the emperor's purpose was to preserve the equilibrium of Europe. Just as his Majesty was ready to maintain a benevolent neutrality in a war of revenge intended to wrest conquered provinces from Germany, so also his Majesty would not be willing to see a mortal blow inflicted on either one of the belligerent parties. The allusion to the possibility of revenge on the part of France angered the prince. He cried, "Not strike a mortal blow? What does that mean? Nobody proposes to annihilate France. Moreover, is it possible to destroy a nationality?"

As it was not possible to agree upon the wording of the additional phrases, Shuvalov proposed to go back to the original draft of the first article, to make no mention of either Austria or France, and to take up this question in an entirely distinct clause and dispose of it, at need, by an exchange of notes, which while explaining and setting forth the obligations of Germany toward Austria should also mention the desire of the Emperor Alexander III. to see France preserved from any mortal blow that might be inflicted under certain circumstances. "Let us come back then", said the chancellor, "to the version which I proposed to you the other day, that is, to rewrite article I. in a sense specially defensive in the case of a war with a third power". Shuvalov would not accept this version. In truth, of what advantage would it be to us to have the benefits of benevolent neutrality only in case of attack by some third power?

Was it our fault if we had more enemies than Germany, which had but one? Could we bind ourselves, in respect to Austria and especially in respect to Turkey, to remain impassive in the face of every threat, perhaps even that of having the hostility of Germany in case we should see ourselves obliged to act in a direction which she might judge to be aggressive?

But then [replied Bismarck] you ask us for our neutrality in case of war between you and England or Turkey or Italy, and you concede to us in return only a half-neutrality, and that merely in case of war between us and France. Let us grant that this half-neutrality is the equivalent of that which we promise you in the case of war between you and Austria; but we should still be undertaking three whole ones besides. Now, is that fair?

Shuvalov refused to follow the chancellor into this discussion. He had been instructed to propose to the court of Berlin a dual arrangement. He knew the ideas of the emperor and of M. de Giers, both of whom looked upon the neutrality of Russia in a war between Germany and France as the equivalent for the reservations which the chancellor made toward us by reason of Germany's obligations toward Austria-Hungary. Moreover, a convention between Germany and Russia without reservations as to the possibility of a dismemberment would have been more than unpopular among us; it was impossible to ignore the disturbed state of Russian public opinion since the treaty of Berlin, which, rightly or wrongly, was regarded as having deprived us of all the advantages which we had attained at so great a cost.

At a loss for further arguments, Shuvalov confessed his inferiority, saying:

I assure you, Prince, that I do not feel strong enough to contend with you. I set things before you as they are. I assure you also that I have no feelings of personal pride about not succeeding in the negotiations which have been confided to me; I make it my sole object to fulfil scrupulously my duty. Therefore I speak frankly, without bargaining or haggling, and if I insist upon the clause concerning France, it is because I know that it is a condition *sine qua non*.

Bismarck took pity on his interlocutor. He collected himself and, after a few moments of reflection, dictated to Shuvalov this form of reservation of article I.: "This provision shall not apply to Austria and to France save in the case that one of the high contracting parties shall be attacked either by Austria or by France".

In the next interview, Bismarck proposed the following language: "This provision shall not apply to a war against Austria or France resulting from an attack made on one of those two powers

by one of the high contracting parties".³ This form was adopted. The reading of the third article of the *projet*, relating to the closing of the Straits, brought out during the discussions the declaration by Bismarck, often repeated by him, that Germany was ready to see us masters of the Straits and established at Constantinople—that we might, in his phrase, possess the key to our own house. But this declaration could not appear in the principal instrument; it must be made a separate stipulation, for any indiscretion respecting it might be fatal to us by disclosing too early our aspirations. Similarly, by Bismarck's advice, the clause respecting the forbidding of entrance into the Black Sea was to be kept secret and drawn up separately. This task Shuvalov carried out; the secret clause was made the substance of one of the articles of the protocol annexed to the convention of June 6/18, 1887. That convention was concluded for three years instead of five as Shuvalov preferred, and signed by him and Count Herbert Bismarck. From the fact that the Emperor William had shortened the term of the convention, and that the chancellor had avoided signing it, by deputing his son to do so in his stead, M. de Giers believed he could infer that this arrangement was more advantageous to Russia than to Germany. On reading this remark of his minister the tsar added: "Perhaps". Austria had been excluded from the negotiation for reasons stated above in the ministerial report.

In the summer of this same year the Emperor William had a meeting with the Emperor Francis Joseph at Gastein. The latter expressed to his ally his regret at seeing Russia withdraw from the *entente* which had united the three courts, but William refrained from breathing a word of the arrangement concluded with Russia. "I shall do the same", said Bismarck to Shuvalov, "when I see Kalnóky".

III.

The document of June 6/18, 1887, is thus expressed:

The Imperial Courts of Russia and Germany, animated by an equal desire to confirm general peace by an understanding designed to assure the defensive position of their respective states, have resolved to embody in a special arrangement the accord established between them, against the expiration on June 15/27, 1887, of the treaty signed in 1881 and renewed in 1884. To this end the plenipotentiaries of the two courts have agreed on the following articles:

Article I. In the case that one of the high contracting parties should find itself at war with a third great power, the other would

³ "Cette disposition ne s'appliquerait pas à une guerre contre l'Autriche ou la France dans le cas où cette guerre résulterait d'une attaque dirigée contre l'une de ces dernières puissances par l'une des hautes parties contractantes."

maintain toward it a benevolent neutrality and would devote its efforts to the localization of the conflict.

This provision shall not apply to a war against Austria or France resulting from an attack made upon one of these two powers by one of the high contracting parties.

Article II. Germany recognizes the rights historically acquired by Russia in the Balkan peninsula, and particularly the rightfulness of a preponderating and decisive influence on her part in Bulgaria and Eastern Rumelia. The two courts pledge themselves to permit no modification of the territorial *status quo* in that peninsula without a previous agreement between them, and to oppose, as it arises, every attempt to disturb that *status quo* or to modify it without their consent.

Article III. The two courts recognize the European and naturally obligatory character of the principle of the closing of the Straits of the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles, founded on the law of nations, confirmed by treaties, and set forth in the declaration made by the second plenipotentiary of Russia at the Congress of Berlin, in the session of July 12 (Protocol 19). They will take care in common that Turkey makes no exception to this rule in favor of the interests of any government by lending to military operations of a belligerent power that portion of its empire adjoining the Straits. In case of infraction or to prevent infraction in case it is in prospect, the two courts shall warn Turkey that they would consider her, if such were to take place, as having put herself in a state of war with the injured party, and as having deprived herself henceforth of the benefits of security assured to her territorial *status quo* by the treaty of Berlin.

In a protocol signed the same day, it was declared that, in order to complete the stipulations of articles II. and III. of the treaty, the two courts had agreed upon the following points:

1. Germany, as in the past, will aid Russia to re-establish in Bulgaria a regular and legal government. She promises that she will in no case give her consent to the restoration of the Prince of Battenberg.
2. In case the Emperor of Russia should find himself obliged to take over the task of defending the entrance into the Black Sea in order to safeguard the interests of Russia, Germany engages to lend benevolent neutrality and her moral and diplomatic support to the measures which his Majesty shall deem it necessary to take in order to guard the key of his empire.

By the terms of the first article of the convention of June 6/18, 1887, Germany, after having protected herself by the Austrian treaty of 1879 against attack on the part of Russia, protected herself by a fresh agreement with Russia against attack on the side of France. This agreement is known by the name of the Reinsurance Treaty. Yet these diplomatic measures did not satisfy the chancellor's prudence; he did not cease to insist on the necessity of increasing the forces of Germany, and perfecting her armament. The number of soldiers under arms in time of peace amounted to 700,000 men. On February 6, 1888, Bismarck caused the text of

the treaty of alliance concluded with Austria on October 7, 1879, to be simultaneously published at Berlin, at Vienna, and at Pesth, in order to put an end, as was explained in the official *communiqué*, to false interpretations of that treaty, which had a purely defensive character. On the same date, in the session of February 6, 1888, the prince delivered a celebrated speech in which he essayed to prove that Germany must be strong enough to defend herself on both fronts, and so invulnerable that she should have no need to begin the attack. The conclusion of the speech resounded like a defiance to the whole world: "We Germans fear God and fear nothing else in the world".

The agreement between Germany and Russia had been made for three years. In 1889, well in advance of its expiration, the Russian minister of foreign affairs was instructed to study the question whether this arrangement with the German Empire should be renewed, and if so, in what form. The first article of the treaty required Germany, except in the case of our attacking Austria, to observe a benevolent neutrality and to endeavor to localize the conflict in any war which Russia might have with a third great power. This clause was not without value. Furthermore Germany promised not to attack France, and recognized that, if she did, she could no longer count on Russia's neutrality. In the East, Germany confirmed and solemnly recognized the principle of the closing of the Straits, and undertook to see to it that Turkey should not infringe upon it in favor of the interests of any government whatever. All these pledges were distinctly useful to us; and on her part Russia, except for the case of an attack by Germany upon France, agreed only to remain neutral, and to exert herself to localize the conflict, in the case of a war between Germany and one of the other great powers. Now, as aggressive action on the part of France was not at all probable, and a rupture between Germany and the other states still less so, this engagement was nowise onerous. Accordingly, December 19, 1889, by order of the tsar, it was agreed that these arrangements should be renewed, without, however, entering upon negotiations before April, 1890.

On February 12 of that year, in an intimate conversation, Bismarck confided to Shuvalov that it was very difficult for him to continue his functions in connection with the young emperor, and that he would like to resign. He said:

My sovereign, who at bottom has little confidence in his mother, has not been able to keep himself free from certain English influences which she brings to bear upon him. It is a veritable conspiracy of English radicals and German socialists. I had a little inkling of the

state of things when I saw the Empress Victoria return to Berlin. Then I asked myself, "What the devil does she mean to do here?" The instrument she makes use of with her son is Mr. Hinzpeter, his former governor, who, I believe, acts without much suspicion of the rôle he is being made to play. A man of liberal convictions, the empress has been able quite to engross him, and it is he, Hinzpeter, who for the moment is the great counsellor of my sovereign. I now see why I was held aloof, why the emperor sent word almost every day, through my son, to me at Friedrichsruhe, not to disturb myself. They were preparing the blow, and it was just at that time that the labor question was in the condition you know of. In spite of my small sympathy for any sort of liberal campaign, yet as a faithful subject I am under obligation not to abandon entirely to their fate the plans of my king. I have already spoken to you of my intention to retire completely from the Prussian administration. But will that be possible? The presidency of the Bundesrath is so closely bound up with my Prussian activities that it is difficult to preserve the former while resigning the latter. Perhaps the most practical thing will be, when the moment comes, to give up the whole thing.

The remainder of the conversation related, by preference, to foreign politics. Shuvalov made use of the opportunity to hint to the chancellor that the English influence, of which he had indicated the traces in internal politics, was also to be observed in international relations; this might bring about a sudden change in German policy and give rise to entirely new points of view. Then he suddenly reminded the chancellor of the existence of the secret treaty of 1887, and remarked that in his opinion that document, in spite of all the value which had been attributed to it on the one side and on the other, had really of itself exerted but a slight influence upon the good relations of the two empires, and that even without it such relations would without doubt have been maintained. "What do you think about that?" asked Shuvalov.

Oh! [replied the prince] if it is my personal opinion you ask, I shall reply without hesitation; yes, I vote for the continuance of our *entente*. I am quite ready to admit with you that our treaty has not, of itself alone, been indispensable to the maintenance of the good relations between us; nevertheless there it is, a document that defines clearly the policy which we are following and which, in my judgment, ought not to be changed. I have said it publicly, I have said it in intimate conversations with your sovereign, I have repeated it to you many times; my opinions, my sentiments are always the same. I take no interest whatever in Bulgaria or in Constantinople. You can do what you please there; it is not I who will prevent you. It is only the integrity of the Austro-Hungarian territory that we have to defend. You know that. There, in my eyes, is a political necessity. Austria cannot be wiped off the map of Europe; but as for your contentions outside her territory, that does not affect me. People once tried to frighten me by hinting to me that Austria might come to a direct understanding with Russia, and so transact her business without me. To that I replied that

it not only would not be unfortunate, but on the contrary very fortunate, and that certainly it would not be I that would be troubled by it. The disinterestedness that I profess in regard to Constantinople and the Straits would not be at all modified thereby. As for France, I believe that the fear of seeing us eat up that country has had time to evaporate. We should never be such fools as to commence a war that could bring us nothing.

Then taking up, after some moments of reflection, the chapter of hypotheses as to the future, he went on:

Here is how I see things. I do not believe in any deliberate hostility on the part of your emperor toward Germany; I do not even believe that in case of war between us and France you would immediately take up arms to assist that country. You would no doubt have recourse in such case to an armed demonstration, and if the first victories were favorable to us, you would check us by indicating to us that we were not to go farther. We are moreover not greedy for new provinces. Those we now have give us already quite enough trouble, and after all is said, one does not destroy nationalities. I will even go so far as to say that the preservation of France is a necessity to Germany also, in view of certain eventualities that might come forward in our relations with England. When I was at Reims, somebody said to me, "Go ahead and crown your king emperor of Germany and of Gaul". I laughed, and said, even then, "Nationalities are not wiped out by a stroke of the pen; as witness the Polish nationality, which has managed to keep itself in existence in spite of having lost its political unity".

Count Shuvalov observed to the chancellor that the secret treaty defined, in a decisive and unmistakable manner, the point of view of Russia in respect to France; that it was precisely the case of attack that it provided for, and that the integrity of the French territory was an essential condition of the maintenance of the balance in Europe. Prince Bismarck on his part declared that the secret treaty, in his opinion, corresponded so exactly to the situation which the two contracting parties had both desired to create, that even to define its duration would be, strictly speaking, unnecessary, the text of the agreement being, so to speak, the expression of a fixed and unchanging situation.

Count Shuvalov ended his despatch by concluding that the chancellor would ask nothing better than to renew our reciprocal engagements, and the tsar minuted at the end the following words: "I think, in effect, that to Bismarck our *entente* is in some sort a guarantee that no written agreement exists between us and France, and that is very important for Germany".

After an absence of some weeks, Shuvalov on March 5/17 called on the chancellor at the latter's invitation. He found him in a state of great excitement, for the resignation of the prince and of

his son had been accepted. The divergence of opinion between Emperor William II. and his chancellor on internal questions had extended to foreign policy, in which, the prince declared, one of the grievances that the emperor had represented to him was the Russophile policy which Bismarck had pursued up to that time. The same imputation is reported by Prince Clovis Hohenlohe in his memoirs.⁴ William II. had no confidence in the foreign policy of Bismarck. He suspected him of having private views which he was concealing, of wishing to abandon Austria and the Triple Alliance in order to join hands with Russia, while the emperor, who had given his word to Francis Joseph to be a faithful ally to him, held to the treaty with Austria-Hungary.

Count Shuvalov wrote that what was then passing at Berlin was more than strange, and that one was forced to ask oneself whether the young emperor was in his normal state. In the night of March 9/21 the ambassador was awakened by a messenger from Emperor William, who requested him to come to his Majesty at eight o'clock in the morning. Scarcely had he arrived at the hour indicated, when he was received by the emperor with a kindness and cordiality beyond all expression:

Sit down and listen to me [he said]; you know how much I love and respect your sovereign. Your emperor has been too good to me for me to do otherwise than to inform him personally of the situation created by the events which have just taken place. Tell his Majesty, then, that I have parted with my old chancellor, for it was truly impossible to keep on working with him in view of the state of his health and the excitable condition of his nerves. Herbert Bismarck told me last evening that you were authorized by your sovereign to pursue the negotiations respecting the renewal of our secret treaty, but that at present you had abandoned them. Why? I beg you to tell his Majesty that on my part I am entirely disposed to renew our agreement, that my foreign policy remains and will remain the same as it was in the time of my grandfather. That is my firm resolve. I shall not depart from it, and you can resume your negotiations with Count Herbert. He wishes to leave me, I believe, but I shall try to keep him at his post.

Shuvalov replied that he had been obliged to suspend negotiations because of not knowing who were the persons with whom he was to conduct them.

I was informed of your conversation with Prince Bismarck [replied the emperor], and the chancellor was also authorized to conduct the negotiations to the consummation that we intended; nothing has changed, then, and I rely upon your friendship to lay the situation before your emperor, assuring him that nothing has changed either in

⁴ *Denkwürdigkeiten des Fürsten Chlodwig zu Hohenlohe-Schillingsfürst*, II. 465-466 (II. 424 of Eng. trans.).

my personal sentiments toward him or in my policy in regard to Russia. . . .

You know [he went on], how many malevolent assertions accompanied my advent to the throne. People attributed war-like tendencies to me, said I was eager for glory, etc., etc. Yet I have done whatever I could for the preservation of peace, and that is what I desire for Germany, that is what I strive for in my foreign policy, just as much as I desire the preservation of order in internal affairs.

After having read Count Shuvalov's despatch, the tsar wrote on it the following annotation: "Nothing more satisfactory could be looked for. We shall see by the sequel whether deeds correspond to words. For the moment it is quite reassuring." On the proposal of Count Herbert, the negotiation of the *entente* was transferred to St. Petersburg and entrusted to General Schweinitz, German ambassador at the court of Russia. He was well acquainted with the affair, while those at the ministry at Berlin had not yet mastered it. General Schweinitz had to wait a long time for his instructions, and when they arrived at Berlin, he found that Germany refused to renew the agreement with Russia.

In making his explanations to M. de Giers on March 26, 1890, the general described the new chancellor's point of view on the relations between Germany and Russia. General Caprivi declared that there would be no change in those relations, that his policy would be simple and transparent, would give no occasion for any misunderstanding, and would cause neither alarm nor distrust. Caprivi's view was that such a policy did not admit of a secret agreement, especially with Russia, where public opinion would be little in favor of such a compact. On the report made by M. de Giers the tsar wrote the following annotations:

In my secret heart, I am well content that Germany has been the first to refuse the renewal of the treaty, and I do not particularly regret the ending of the *entente*. But the new chancellor's views about our relations are very significant. It appears to me that Bismarck was right when he said that the policy of the German emperor would alter from the day that he, Bismarck, should retire.

To Count Shuvalov's mind, Caprivi's refusal to renew the agreement could have two explanations: one, that William counted on the accession of Great Britain to the Triple Alliance, the other, that the new chancellor took the alliance with Austria more seriously than his predecessor had done. Caprivi had said to Shuvalov that he was little versed in the intricacies of diplomacy; his predecessor was strong enough to juggle with several balls at once, while he considered himself lucky if he succeeded with only two.

The arguments which Caprivi used to justify his refusal to re-

new the agreement with Russia seemed far from convincing to M. de Giers. It was true that in a former time relations of friendship could subsist between the two courts without any formal treaty, but since then the situation had become quite different: Germany had contracted alliances confirming the so-called league of peace which under certain circumstances might take on a character far from consistent with good relations between us and the cabinet of Berlin. Under these conditions, the advice of Prince Bismarck respecting the expediency of guaranteeing our mutual interests against every eventuality by means of a treaty seemed to M. de Giers very judicious. Accordingly he did not conceal from Schweinitz his surprise at seeing Caprivi's objections prevail over the intentions and desires personally expressed by his sovereign. He did not wish in the least to doubt the sincerity of the emperor's words, or those of the chancellor, but he would have wished that Shuvalov should have taken pains to clear up this enigma by leading General Caprivi to make a categorical statement in one form or another. Shuvalov might have suggested to him the idea of an exchange of notes declaring that, without renewing the secret treaty of 1887, the two powers desired to confirm the relations of perfect friendship subsisting between them, by stating the continued validity of the bases of their *entente*, both in respect to the question of the Balkan peninsula and in respect to the closing of the Straits.

In dealing with this proposition on the part of the minister, Shuvalov asked himself first of all, what motives might have determined Caprivi not to renew the secret arrangement with Russia. In the first place, the chancellor believed that a *rapprochement* between Germany and Russia would not be in harmony with public opinion on our side. And on general principles he doubted the value of treaties not founded on the real expression of national sentiments; hence his fears as to the consequences which might ensue in case our secret arrangements should ever be disclosed.

At this point in the despatch the Emperor Alexander writes on the margin: "This is more than correct".

There existed also a second consideration which in the mind of the young sovereign militated against a renewal of our agreement. William hoped to win over England to the so-called league of peace. This would evidently be a matter of capital importance for us, for it would touch our secret treaty on an essential side, that of our preponderant influence in Bulgaria and of the possession of Constantinople. Shuvalov had always viewed with suspicion the accord which for two years past had tended to become established between

Great Britain and Germany, in spite of the friction due to the divergent colonial interests of the two countries, especially in Central Africa. Yet, thanks to the spirit of conciliation displayed on both sides, the delimiting of their respective spheres of influence in Africa had had results surpassing in its effect the most roseate expectations, principally by the cession to the Emperor William of the island of Heligoland, so important to Germany by reason of its geographical situation between the mouths of the Elbe and the Weser. In return, Great Britain received large advantages in Africa.

Shuvalov saw in the concessions which the two governments had made to each other clear evidence of their mutual efforts to strengthen intimate and cordial relations. Herein lay, in his view, the motives which had dissuaded the German chancellor from renewing the secret arrangement with Russia. Should we not risk failure if we entered upon negotiations with Caprivi with a view to suggesting the substitution, for our existing compact, of an exchange of notes declaring the continued maintenance of the bases of the old *entente*? So Shuvalov asked himself. The tsar made the following note upon the report which M. de Giers made to him on June 11, 1890:

I am rather of Shuvalov's opinion. Once it appears that Germany is indisposed to renew our secret agreement, it seems to me that our dignity does not permit us to ask why. We shall see what is the matter when the Emperor and Caprivi come here. No doubt a change has come over German policy, and we ought to be prepared for any event.

In another annotation of June 14, the tsar writes:

Count Kutuzov⁵ has just left me and has given me his impressions. They are not reassuring or consoling. From day to day the emperor's nervous state grows worse and those about him are struck with the changeableness of his character and of his ideas. The progressive development of armaments makes the situation more alarming.

Prince Lobanov-Rostovski, Russian ambassador at Vienna, speaking of the refusal of Germany to renew arrangements with Russia, saw in it a very grave event. He had always thought not only that Kalnóky had been kept informed of the negotiation, but also that the check which it had received was probably due to the action of the cabinet of Vienna, which wished to reserve to itself the support of Germany in repulsing any attack on the part of Russia, even in case Austria should be the aggressor, though the latter, said the prince, was very improbable, "but the burden of the military armaments is such that nothing is certain".

⁵ Count Golenishchev-Kutuzov, major-general in attendance, was attached to the person of the Emperor William.

On August 5, 1890, William II. came to Russia to be present at the manoeuvres at Narva, and General Caprivi came in his train. In his conversations with M. de Giers, the chancellor declared that there was a general desire for peace which removed every cloud from the political horizon, a desire which was especially lively and sincere on Germany's part. The predominant idea of the reign of William II. was, said Caprivi, to react against the increasing peril of socialism and to remove all that might threaten internal tranquillity and order. The emperor destined the considerable force under his control to the prosecution of this great object alone, and understood perfectly well that, for the attainment of that object, permanent peace in foreign affairs was absolutely necessary. M. de Giers endeavored to demonstrate to Caprivi that we desired to maintain and perpetuate the traditional bonds of cordial good feeling between the two countries, much less by means of written stipulations than by an uninterrupted flow of mutual confidence. He asked him frankly what was his point of view respecting the matters on which agreement had been established between Russia and Germany, specifically respecting Bulgarian affairs and the closing of the Straits. It appeared to us certain: (1) that after all the sacrifices which Russia had made in order to create Bulgaria she could never consent to sanction the illegal power which Prince Ferdinand was exercising in contravention of the stipulations of the treaty of Berlin; (2) that the principle of the closing of the Straits remained a European principle, incontestably binding on all the powers signatory to the treaties concluded between them. Caprivi recognized that our position on these two points was scrupulously in accord with the treaties in force, and declared that, so far as he was concerned, Germany entirely agreed with that position. The same assurances were received by the Emperor Alexander at the private audience which his Majesty accorded to the chancellor. The details of his conversation with Caprivi were reproduced by M. de Giers in a despatch of August 19, 1890, to Count Muraviev, Russian chargé d'affaires at Berlin, who was instructed to communicate this despatch and to obtain from the chancellor a written confirmation of all that had been said on that occasion. Caprivi was much surprised at such a request.

Why [said he], that seems to me entirely useless. I am completely resolved not to write down anything. You have been instructed to read me a despatch which, I agree, reproduces very faithfully the political views exchanged between M. de Giers and me; you have done so; but to address anything of the sort to you in writing, no; I have not the political strength of Bismarck, but I am loyal, and you can rely upon our loyalty, which will never fail you.

Count Muraviev hastened to say that he had acted on his own motion. The chancellor replied:

I know it well. M. de Giers could never have charged you to ask it of me, since I have often told him that I would absolutely refuse to give him anything in writing relating to our exchange of views on political questions. . .

I was about to rise [writes Muraviev], when the general said to me in German: "You, who have lived in Berlin a number of years, know better than anyone else, with what serious difficulties the government is obliged to contend in internal affairs. These difficulties are enormous, and in smoothing them out our sovereign, even if he were eager for triumphs, would find enough laurels to gather on this field, to make his reign, even if it were very long, much more glorious than if he should wish to make it illustrious by victories won on the field of battle. We desire peace above all things, and you ought to be convinced of it."

At the very moment that the Emperor of Germany and his chancellor, in their conversations with the Russian diplomats in Berlin and at St. Petersburg, were assuring the latter that their sole desire was to preserve the peace, William II., in opening the new session of the Reichstag, May 6, 1890, delivered a speech in which he declared in similar terms that the consolidation of universal peace upon durable bases was the object of all his efforts; to secure it the alliances which Germany had concluded, for her defense, with Austria and with Italy, must be maintained; but the surest means of guarantee lay nevertheless in the development of the military resources of the empire. According to the emperor's declaration, every change in the relative position of states endangered the political equilibrium and the prospects of success in all the efforts made for the maintenance of peace. Therefore Germany must be strong enough to have the upper hand in Europe and to make use of her preponderance to maintain equilibrium among the states. In line with these declarations a bill was introduced in the Reichstag increasing the peace strength of the army by 18,574 men. The supplementary proposals for the military budget were raised to eighteen million marks per annum. The minister of war, Verdy du Vernois, declared that this was but the first step in this direction, and that the German High Command would not stop in its course before it arrived at its objects. The general looked forward to the necessity, in time, of calling to the ranks of the army all the Germans liable to military service, without any exception, which would have increased the effective strength of the army in time of peace not by eighteen thousand but by fifty-five thousand men. This plan was supported by Field-Marshal von Moltke, who vindicated the urgency of this measure by referring to the armaments

made by the states bordering on the west and the east. The minister of war went still further; he declared that Germany ought to develop her military strength to such a point that it could not be either equalled or surpassed by any other power. By the superiority of her armament she counted on maintaining general peace in Europe and extending her rule without encountering resistance in the other quarters of the globe. Already Germany had taken possession of immense territories in West, Southwest, and East Africa, and of several groups of islands in Oceania and had founded colonies there. German expansion, especially in East Africa, had brought the Germans into collision with the English. This dispute was proving an obstacle to *rapprochement* between the cabinets of Berlin and London on general political questions.

As we have seen above, an accord was reached, to the great contentment of both of these powers. William II. in particular ardently desired such agreement. In a speech at Berlin on March 21, 1890, at a dinner in honor of the Prince of Wales, Albert Edward, and his son George, the emperor recalled the fact that the English and German armies had fought side by side at Waterloo and expressed the hope that the English fleet, joined with the German army and fleet, would devote itself to the preservation of peace in the times to come. In such a speech the Emperor William could have in view no other adversary than Russia.

This speech was delivered by William II. at dinner on March 9/21, the same day on which, early in the morning, he had received the Russian ambassador in special audience and had assured him of his sincere desire to renew the secret agreement with Russia, as well as of his fixed determination to follow the policy of his grandfather in his relations with foreign powers.

It was not without reason that the tsar Alexander III. noted at the foot of Shuvalov's despatch this remark: "We shall see by the sequel whether deeds correspond to words".

SERGE GORIAINOV.

NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS

THE CONSTRUCTION OF A CHAPTER ON THE GREEK MIDDLE AGE

For more than a decade the Minoan Age has been a familiar term; its leading characteristics are now common knowledge, and the problems involved in its treatment are clearly formulated. Less progress has been made with the period immediately following, which Eduard Meyer designates as "Middle", but which he has incompletely set forth. The lack of progress in the historical reconstruction of this age is typified by Beloch's treatment in the second edition of his *Griechische Geschichte*, in which he has limited himself to Homer and the scantiest use of archaeology. Meanwhile material from excavations has rapidly accumulated. Most important in recent years are the British explorations in Laconia (*Annual of the British School at Athens*, beginning with vol. XI.; see also *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, beginning with vol. XXVII.) and the German in Miletus (*Milet: die Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen und der Untersuchungen seit dem Jahre 1899*, in course of publication by Reimer, Berlin), to which should be added the lesser "finds" from various parts of the Aegean area.¹

The period begins about 1200 B.C., when the Minoan decorative style has yielded to the geometric, and extends to about the middle of the eighth century, when written documents begin. It resembles the European Middle Ages in that both followed the inroads of barbarians and that both were marked by a vast decline and an incipient recovery of culture.

The aim of this article is to present in systematic order the topics appropriate to a chapter on the period and to indicate briefly how in the opinion of the writer they should be treated. The reader will understand that the interpretations are not necessarily final.

In this period the colonial movement from the Greek peninsula eastward to the Anatolian coast, begun in the preceding age, was completed. The chief feature, however, was the blending of the northern invaders with the native Minoans, and through it the formation of the Hellenic race and of Hellenic culture. We discover

¹ See especially F. Poulsen, *Die Dipylongräber und die Dipylonvasen* (Leipzig, 1905); D. G. Hogarth, *Excavations at Ephesus* (British Museum, 1908, 2 vols.); and the reports on the excavations at Samos in *Abhandlungen Berlin. Akademie*, beginning in 1911.

the process of assimilation at various stages. In Crete were communities of diverse speech existing side by side; in Ionia the mingling of peoples was under way, whereas in Attica and in Laconia we come upon the completed blend. Within the Aegean area the Minoan civilization had been most intense from Crete and Laconia northward to Attica and the Cyclades, in other words the region which in the Middle Age came to be occupied by the Dorians and the Ionians. A map of Hellas in the Middle Age accordingly will show this area fundamentally Minoan, though necessarily modified by external and internal forces. The historian of the age will therefore treat of the Dorians and Ionians as a cultural unit, though exhibiting local differences, whereas the contrasts of later time arose mainly from the greater progressiveness of the Ionians. For example, there prevailed throughout the area a nearly uniform social structure, in which the great lord commanded the labor of a multitude of serfs, whose rights and duties were clearly defined by customary law. The *mnōitai* of Crete, the Laconian *heLOTS*, the *hectemori* of Attica, and the *gergithai* of Ionia seem to be remnants of Minoan serfdom. In Ionia, too, as in Crete and Laconia, the citizens ate at public tables.

The leadership in the fine arts at first belonged to Crete but soon passed to Ionia. The Phoenicians were also heirs of Minoan culture. Their chief contribution to civilization was neither in art nor in navigation, but in the transmission of writing from the Minoans to the Hellenes of the Middle Age. In the view now most probable the Minoan linear script through wearing and selection gradually grew simpler, the Cypriote syllabary being a stage in the process. A further simplification took place in northern Syria when the number of characters was reduced to twenty-two. This system the Ionians adopted and by further changes made phonetic. The Greeks were far more creative than the Phoenicians and gave that people more than they received from them. From the ninth to the seventh century, accordingly, it was not the Phoenicians but the Ionians who were leaders in the geometric and the "Orientalizing" art that extended from the Euphrates to Etruria.

Perhaps no external feature of life so characterizes the classical Greeks as their loose, graceful dress. From this point of view their ancestors of the Middle Age seem foreign. Among the laborers the Minoan waist-cloth continued far down into historical times. An innovation, however, was the *chiton*, probably of Oriental origin. Its tightness is reminiscent of Minoan conditions. Woman's dress was more conservative. Doubtless the grand lady, like

Artemis Orthia of Sparta, wore a low-cut waist with shoulder straps, a belt, and a tight skirt of strongly Minoan aspect. The introduction of the fibula, however, was bringing about a revolution in dress. This method of fastening was used in the peplos, which gradually prevailed over other styles and became the Doric gown of the historical age. Garments of both sexes were elaborately adorned with inwoven or embroidered patterns of the prevailing geometric style. The hair of women and men alike grew long, and hung down in several heavy strands on both sides of the face, and was held in order by a band encircling the head. Although these styles of dress began to appear early in the Mycenaean Age (about 1500 B.C.), it was not till the Middle Age that they displaced the Minoan patterns.

One of the most important constructive elements in the new civilization which gradually emerged from the decadence of the old was the rise of an iron industry. The controversy over the place of its origin is now definitely settled by documentary evidence in favor of the Hittite country in eastern Asia Minor (*Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft*, XVIII. 61, n. 1). This industry, including the process of hardening to steel, must have flourished as early as the fourteenth century. In the thirteenth it made its way to Crete, whence it passed more slowly over the disturbed Aegean region to Laconia, Attica, Thessaly, and their colonies. While the metal was still scarce in Laconia, it began to be used as money. It is unnecessary here to dilate on the increased efficiency brought by the use of iron and steel to every walk of life.

No human activity felt the impetus more keenly than warfare, which at the same time was affected by new economic and political causes. The clumsy chariot was consigned to the archaeological junk-heap and horse-back riding was substituted for it. Meanwhile the extension of prosperity, involving military and political aspirations, to a wider circle of the population brought into existence a body of troops which we may describe as heavy-armed, though their shields were lighter than the Minoan. It was mainly the introduction of steel swords and lance-points that compelled the strengthening of the defensive armor. The round or oval targe, reinforced by a central boss, became the normal shield. At the same time the warrior protected his head with a helmet topped by a high bronze crest, his body with a hauberk of metal plates, and adopted bronze greaves for the legs below the knees.

In religion, too, great changes took place. Among the Minoans the burial of the unburned body, involving a worship of the dead,

prevailed with but the slightest trace of cremation. The custom of burning the dead, now introduced by the Northerners, doubtless weakened the belief in the power of ghosts and in the need of ancestor worship. Gradually, however, inhumation reasserted itself; and henceforth the two forms existed side by side, yet with inhumation more common than burning. It is a curious fact that within this sphere of thought and usage historical Greece preserved more than half of its Minoan heritage. The work of analyzing the greater gods of Hellas into their Minoan and Indo-European elements has scarcely begun, and yet enough has been done to warrant the assumption that in all probability no single historical deity of Greece is in character and attributes wholly Indo-European or wholly Minoan. The motive to the amalgamation and something of the process are ascertainable. The immigrants to Miletus, for example, were as receptive of native cults as of native blood. The desire to secure the protection of the local deities and the good-will of the Carians went hand in hand with greed for the properties of these gods. Identifying their own sky-deity Zeus with the god of the double axe, they converted the shrines and sacred domains of the Carian deity to their own service. No less than six altars to Zeus Labraundios accordingly have been found in Miletus. In like manner their Artemis usurped the property and various attributes of the Anatolian Great Mother. The character and functions of Apollo, especially his healings, purifications, and oracles, seem to be in considerable part Minoan. These are but suggestions of a vast and intricate amalgamation which cannot as yet be analyzed in detail. The prevailing tendency to-day is to assign to the invading people the sunnier aspects of religion, while leaving to the natives the gloomy features, including magic, the worship of ghosts, the doctrine of sin, and its purification by washing in blood. This contrast seems justified but should not be pushed to extremes. The great deities were mainly goddesses as in the Minoan past; and correspondingly women occupied a high place in society.

It has long been known that there were two types of Minoan palace: one, which we may call Mediterranean, centred in an open court, whereas the nucleus of the other, described as European or as "northern", was a great hall with a central hearth and a gabled roof. The earliest and simplest form of Greek temple, distinguished as *in antis*, developed from the second type. The earliest now known to us is that of Artemis Orthia at Sparta, erected probably in the ninth century B.C. It consisted of a wooden frame with walls of unburnt brick resting on a foundation of stone. The

apex of the gabled roof was supported by an inner row of wooden columns running lengthwise through the centre. It was a small building, less than fifteen by thirty feet in extent, designed mainly as a shelter for the deity and her utensils and gifts, whereas in her worship the community gathered about her great altar outside. It was not till the latter half of the seventh century that large stone temples began to be erected.

This is but a hasty view of the Ionian-Dorian civilization during the Middle Age. With due appreciation of the danger of attributing too much to the brilliant Cretans the present writer cannot escape the conviction that the life of this area in the period under consideration was more Minoan than Indo-European. The case is quite different with the Aeolians, who inhabited Thessaly and Boeotia and colonized Lesbos and Chios with the neighboring Anatolian coast. These people were not affected by Minoan culture till its late decadent stage, and then but superficially. They were men of new blood and fresh ideas, whose life, in all probability, is pictured by Homer. For many years it has been widely assumed that Homer was an Ionian and that the civilization he presents was mainly that of Ionia, approximately in the period from 1000 or 900 to 700 B.C. It was the merit of Andrew Lang (*World of Homer*) to prove that this could not be, that, for example, in an important group of religious ideas the Ionians of that time were Minoan, whereas Homer was in this respect Indo-European. Without following Lang farther let us notice that the Aeolian colonies of Asia Minor, to which the most distinct tradition assigns Homer, were Indo-European, as stated above. The poems, however, are a complex of tradition, environment, and fancy; and their analysis into these elements is not easy. The environmental element, when ascertained, gives to the picture of the age the life and movement that is lacking in archaeological material.

GEORGE WILLIS BOTSFORD.²

² By reason of the sudden death of the learned author, on December 13, this last of his valued contributions to this journal is printed without inspection of proofs by him.

DOCUMENTS

The American Minister in Berlin, on the Revolution of March, 1848

ANDREW JACKSON DONELSON (1799-1871), author of the despatches which follow, was a nephew of the wife of General Jackson. Educated at Cumberland College, at West Point, and at Transylvania University, he was for several years a member of Jackson's family, and was for some time the President's private secretary. Employed by Tyler to negotiate the acceptance by Texas of his plans of annexation to the United States, he acquitted himself of that task in such a manner as additionally to commend him to Polk, of whom he had already been a constant friend and ardent political supporter. A considerable portion of their correspondence, ranging in date from 1843 to 1848, has been printed by Professor Sioussat in 1917 in the *Tennessee Historical Magazine*, III. 51-73, and other portions of Donelson's political correspondence, of 1844 and 1845, in the same volume, pages 134-162. Of the former group, the letters on pages 70-73 relate to Polk's appointment of Donelson as envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Prussia. He was nominated on March 5, 1846, as successor to Henry Wheaton, the celebrated authority on international law, who on a hint from Polk had resigned after nineteen years of diplomatic service to his country. Donelson was commissioned March 18, 1846, and soon after sailed for Prussia. In August, 1848, after the events recounted in the despatches printed below, he was further commissioned as envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to the short-lived federal government of Germany. He took leave from his post at Berlin in June, 1849, and returned to America, where the chief events of his subsequent career were his activity in the Nashville campaign of 1850, his brief editorship of the *Washington Union*, and his nomination by the American Party in 1856 for the office of Vice-president.

Although Major Donelson was not a trained diplomat and had no such knowledge of persons and conditions in Berlin or in Europe that his observations add greatly to our knowledge of the events which marked the "Märztage" of 1848 in Berlin, nevertheless a considerable interest attaches to the recital, by an intelligent and experienced American politician, of what he saw going on before

his eyes in the Prussian capital at a time when a democratic revolution seemed to threaten the continuance of the Hohenzollern monarchy. Present conditions obviously heighten this interest.

The following despatches, addressed in March, 1848, to Secretary Buchanan, are printed from the originals in the Department of State in Washington, Bureau of Indexes and Archives, Prussian Despatches, volume IV. Donelson's drafts of these despatches, differing but slightly in text from the despatches actually sent, may be found among the Donelson Papers lately acquired by the Library of Congress.

I.

No. 60.

BERLIN, March 4th, 1848

Sir,

Since my despatch of the 26th ult^o. the great events at Paris are announced here, and have astounded all classes of Society. It was foreseen that Mr. Guizot would fall, but not that a monarchy would be succeeded by a Republic. The disposition of this King¹ on the occasion is marked by his calmness and is in accord with the policy demanded by his personal interests and the views of Germany. He proposes no aggressive movement, but is understood to take the ground that France must be undisturbed by foreign force unless she invades the jurisdiction of other States. His regular troops are kept in a state of immediate preparation for action, but the reserves of the Landwehr are not called for, nor is it supposed that more will be done on the Rhine than to supply the Fortifications with ample provisions.

You will see in the German and English papers the proclamation made by the Germanic Diet, in which the idea of interference with France is disclaimed, whilst the necessity of union among the German States is strongly urged.

It may be safely said that this Government will use its influence to prevent war, neither intervening to restore Monarchy in France, nor to influence her deliberations in respect to her new form of Government. It may be also confidently anticipated that the King of Prussia will take measures to quiet the complaints of his subjects in regard to the petitions which were debated in the last assembly of the States.² This he can do with the more grace as the most important of them was reserved for deliberation. Biennial convocations of the chambers, their right to vote on the budgets and to be consulted on all the questions of taxation, are demands which he can concede, and which will remove discontent.

The point of the greatest danger in the present state of affairs is the Austrian connection with Italy, and the obstinacy with which Prince Metternich may seek to maintain the old doctrines of 1815. If he expects to revive a contract in which Monarchs, as contradistinguished from the people, will assist each other in supporting their personal pretensions, he will be disappointed, as I cannot think that England, or Prussia, or even Russia, would be willing to wage a war for a principle so utterly opposed to the spirit of the times. It is ap-

¹ Frederick William IV.

² The parliament of April 11—June 25, 1847.

parent that the great question is one of locality, between each people and their existing form of Government—a question to be settled by each for itself alone, without foreign intervention. Pope Pius rallies the influence of Catholicism to this mode of solving the question, and now that France mingles her enthusiasm with his it is obvious that a different course of action would produce a general war.

You are aware however of the inflammability of the materials now on the surface, and as none were prepared for the scenes at Paris, so there may be none who foresee what may be their consequences. It is to be hoped that France will adhere to the declaration that she will not interfere with her neighbors.

Among the circumstances contributing to the preservation of peace is the general want of sympathy for Louis Phillipe. Being put in by a revolution, those Monarchs who claim their Thrones by divine right, would not object much to see him put out by a revolution, were it not for the conviction that it is the effect of a principle which will in the end reach them.

There is another security for peace in the totally different character of the French and the Germans. The Germans do not like to make a reform by means of a revolution. They love the substance but prefer to receive it as a concession from the King, without the risk of civil war. French Enthusiasm is perhaps the most needed to improve the latin and southern races, German patience the best calculated to carry reform into the Slavonic nations. The field for each is great and extensive, and if occupied in the right manner, may soon exhibit the fruits of civilization and liberty.

But I fear to trust to anticipations so cheering to an American heart. When I look at the condition of Europe—its thousands dying for want of bread, its millions without a conception of that personal independence on which our system rests, its territorial divisions, nationalised by the accidents of brute force, with but little regard to homogeneousness of character and interest, or to the principles of political equality, it seems unreasonable to indulge the hope that France will rise superior to the combinations which may be formed against her.

I shall not trouble you on this occasion with the probable effect of present events on the commercial questions of the Zollverein. Yet it is obvious that in this point of view they are deeply interesting, whether there be peace or war.

I am very respectfully
Your obdt. servt.

A. J. DONELSON.

Hon James Buchanan,
Secy. of state, etc.

Since writing the above I have good authority for saying that Prussia and Austria have agreed to render each other reciprocal support, if the dominions of either are invaded.³ The success of the prin-

³ The American minister had probably heard some version of what General von Radowitz had written from Vienna, March 4, as to the good results already obtained by the special mission on which he had been sent from Berlin March 1, at Metternich's request. R. Koser, "Friedrich Wilhelm IV. am Vorabend der Märzrevolution", in *Historische Zeitschrift*, LXXXIII. 56, quoting from this despatch. *Mémoires du Prince de Metternich*, VII. 597.

ciple of the French movement depends upon the ability of its leaders to keep it from becoming aggressive.

A. J. D.⁴

II.

No. 63.

BERLIN, March 18, 1848.

11 o'clock at night.

Sir,

Since my enclosure of the Proclamation of the King, which convoked the assembly of the States for the 27th of April, and recommended a congress of all the German Sovereigns to be held at Dresden on the 24th inst.,⁵ the revolution in Austria has occurred, and has given additional excitement to the population here and to the Southern portion of Prussia. Troops from the adjoining cities and fortresses, even so far distant as Magdeburgh, have been marched to Berlin, and those stationed in the city had been under arms night and day for the last 56 hours. Yet the people have not been deterred from petitioning the King for concessions as liberal as those granted by Bavaria and the other Southern Powers. This morning March 18th at 10 o'clock he so far yielded as to issue a new proclamation which is enclosed,⁶ but an unfortunate occurrence similar to that which caused the explosion at Paris had the same effect here. A pacification was supposed to have been effected, and the King had presented himself to the multitude assembled in front of his Palace, when some disorder, mistaken by the officer commanding a Troop of Cavalry for an insult either to the King or his Troops, caused the fatal order to charge, and at the same time two muskets were fired. The people dispersed as they could, but went to work instantly to erect Barricades. The church bells commenced ringing about 4 o'clock, the Thousands of Troops were stationed at the most suitable places for attack, and the city has presented the whole of the evening the most awful scene of bloodshed. Cavalry, Infantry, and Artillery have dealt their murderous power upon the crowds who were behind the Barricades, and their fire has not yet ceased. What is the sacrifice of life I have no means of ascertaining yet, but will subjoin the report of the morning. The contest is most unequal, because the people could get but few arms, and they seem to have commenced their resistance without the slightest organization or method.

A deputation from Cologne was in the city, and are said to have been instructed to inform the King that if he disappointed the demand for an immediate convocation of the Diet, and the abolition of the censure of the press, and generally for the concessions which have been made by the other German Governmts, that the Rhine Provinces would secede from his dominion. They were probably content with the Proclamation which was then issued, and which assembles the diet on the 2d of April instead of the 27th April, and promises to submit all the other reforms to the decision of the Diet.

⁴ After this point, signatures and addresses are omitted.

⁵ Proclamation of March 14. Text in *Allgemeine Preussische Zeitung*, March 15, accompanying the despatch. It may also be found in *Reden, Proklamationen, etc., des K. Friedrich Wilhelm IV.*, pp. 4-5.

⁶ "Patent wegen beschleunigter Einberufung des Vereinigten Landtages", in *Extra-Blatt zur Allg. Preuss. Zeitung*, March 18; also in *Reden, etc.*, pp. 5-7. Extracts are printed in the *Annual Register* for 1848, p. 377.

I cannot yet venture an opinion as to the immediate issue of the contest, as one of force between the soldiery and the people, but it is not to be doubted that the latter will gain many of the rights for which they are petitioning. The blood they must shed will be a great misfortune—a misfortune still more to be lamented if it have the effect, which is now probable, of lessening the influence of Prussia in the new combinations which will be the consequence of the revolution. It seems scarcely possible that the German States can adopt immediately a representative principle founded as ours is upon the will of the people. It is therefore desirable whilst they maintain the Monarchic form, that Prussia, the strongest power of them all, should be able to guide them, and secure their counterpoise as a nation in the scale of the other great powers. At present she is in danger of losing this ascendancy, because if France upholds a successful republican experiment, and maintains an amicable feeling toward her neighbors, the tendency will be to union with her, and not with a system which will sympathise with ancient absolutism.

But I defer the expression of the views suggested by this interesting event until the conflict of arms ceases. At present all the world is in a state of panic, particularly the Foreign ambassadors. Business has been suspended for many days—some innocent visitors at the Capital have shared the fate of crowds which they could not avoid—there are none that do not feel the insecurity which belongs to mobs, vengeance, and desperate civil strife. One of my American friends has been cut with a sabre, and 4 or 5 others have made narrow escapes, but I am happy to say that they are compromised by no partizan connection with the struggle. They see the Republican flag occasionally rallying a street assemblage, but they are content to sympathise with it, and feel that the distance which separates it from their happy union, great as it is, is not so great as that which separates the institutions of the two countries.

12 o'clock March 19th.

Peace is not yet restored. Another Proclamation is out from the King⁷ inviting the people to send him another deputation and dictated apparently by a spirit full of compromise. It is enclosed. Messengers are also out announcing that the Military will be withdrawn to the Barracks, if the Barricades are abandoned. The dead and the wounded are borne by the wagon load through the streets, but no one can tell yet the number actually lost. The fire was kept up the whole of the night. It was rendered less fatal by the shelter which the houses afforded, but terrible examples were made of the poor fellows who were caught with arms in their hands. They were dragged from garrets and third stories and shot without mercy.

I hope that the withdrawal of the Military may take place, and that then judicious mediators may be found in the ranks of the Burghers and Magistrates, who, possessing the confidence of the people, will have the means of arresting further bloodshed.

The whole spectacle is a humiliating lesson to us all. We see on

⁷ The proclamation "An meine lieben Berliner"; a facsimile of the same broadside that is folded in Donelson's despatch may be seen in Hans Blum, *Die Deutsche Revolution 1848-49* (Leipzig, 1897), opp. p. 186. See also *Reden*, pp. 8-9. A translation is in the *Annual Register* for 1848, pp. 378-379.

the one hand that great curse of the age, a large standing army, ready with its terrible power, to crush the people, the guilty as well as the innocent. We see on the other both the monarch and the people, when this force is withdrawn, incapable of maintaining order. Happily we are exempt from such spectacles. We have only the people. May we avoid the misfortunes which produce either armies or Kings.

3 oclock.

The military are withdrawn—the barracades are many of them being removed—And there is but little reason to fear a repetition of last nights work. I have walked over the scene of the most bloody collisions between the parties—have seen no threatening crowds. Still there is not absolute certainty that order will be restored, until the Diet convenes and exerts its salutary influence in giving effect to the reforms which will make the Monarchy of Prussia constitutional.

The last arrivals from Vienna and Italy confirm the hope that the revolution confined to the nationalities of the separate people[s] will continue its peaceable form. Whilst this is the state of the question there can be no general war. The strength of the movement lies in the determination of each people to reject intervention—to claim the right of settling their greivances without the aid of foreign powers. It is better for example that Prussia or Saxony should remain unreformed in their Government than that a precedent should be set by which an unfavorable influence could be brought to act against the Democratic tendencies of France and the other German States. When permanent progress is once recognised as the legitimate part of their free systems, it will not be long in communicating its spirit to the Governments, now unwilling to yield to it.

On the whole, looking at the general state of Europe, there is nothing yet to alarm the friend of true reform.

III.

No. 65.

Sir,

I have still time to add another Proclamation of the King announcing a change of his Ministers.⁸ As you read german, I will not trouble you with a translation⁹ and must reserve for the next packet the observations due to so important a movement.

March 19, BERLIN.
at 4 oclock.

IV.

No. 66.

BERLIN, March 20, 1848.

Sir,

As by mailing this direct to Liverpool there is a possibility of its reaching the Steamer for the 24, I avail myself of another moment to tell you that the people have been successful. At the date of my despatches yesterday, the question of withdrawing the soldiery, if the people would abandon the barricades, was under consideration. By 12 yesterday, the regiments had left the city, and it was announced that

⁸ Proclamation of March 19, broadside, enclosed.

⁹ Yet in an instruction to Donelson of August 14, 1846, Buchanan writes, "Not understanding the German language myself, I was obliged", etc. *Works* (ed. Moore), VII. 60.

the people should have arms, if they would call for them at the Arsenal. By sunset the city resounded with acclamations, declaring that now that the King had given his confidence to his subjects, they would defend him as well as themselves. At dark there was a spontaneous illumination of the entire city, and instead of the heartrending spectacle presented the night before, innocent discharges of musquetry in the hands of the people, and deafening huzzas went up from every street and avenue.

A Prussian officer has told me that he estimates the number of loaded cartridges discharged by the soldiers in the course of last night at 100,000. Yet the people maintained the most of their barricades, and exhibited astonishing courage and skill. The fire did not cease at some points until 8 o'clock in the morning, when it was manifest that the spirit of resistance to the royal authority had not only increased, but was prepared to renew the battle no matter what the sacrifice of life. The determination of the King therefore to change his ministry and throw himself upon the loyalty of his subjects, was the only course he could pursue to save the crown.

As an evidence of the character of the contest I may mention the following incident. A commanding officer of one of the regiments led it to one of the barricades near the palace. As he advanced to the charge, a citizen mounted the barricade, and crying out to his countrymen, calling them his children, said, "*My first fire shall be at the commanding officer*". He pulled the trigger and the officer fell dead, but the brave man was soon cut to pieces by a volley from the soldiers. The houses in the neighborhood of this barricade were literally riddled by the musquet balls and grape shot directed at the people within. Yet it was defended from 6 o'clock in the evening until 3 in the morning, by means of tiles from the roofs, stones and brickbats, and the few arms that could be procured.

It would seem impossible, from the length of the struggle and the quantity of Artillery, Cavalry, and Infantry, employed, that so few lives should have been sacrificed, were it not for the fact that the people generally had no arms, and, when not sheltered by the barricades, betook themselves to the houses, from the upper windows of which, as port holes, they could hurl their missiles.

I need not say to you that the house of the legation was most brilliantly illuminated. Independently of the tribute which was due to the noble and gallant conduct of the people, it was also just to the King, who is now placed on a firmer footing, and who may, if sustained by a wise ministry, possibly still regain the ground he has lost by withholding too long the constitution and reforms demanded of him.

V.

No. 67.

BERLIN, March 21st, 1848.

Sir,

I enclose you my correspondence with Baron Canitz, on the occasion of his retiring from the ministry. His successor,¹⁰ who is not yet in communication with the Diplomatic Corps, was distinguished as a speaker in the last assembly of the Diet. But, although then deemed a fair type of the reforms which the national sentiment called for, he seems to be regarded as scarcely equal to the present crisis. He has

¹⁰ Graf von Arnim-Boytzenburg (1803-1868), minister of foreign affairs March 19-21, succeeding Freiherr von Canitz.

great wealth and intelligence, and probably looks to the formation of an Aristocratic branch in the new Constitution of Prussia, analogous in its tendencies to that of Great Britain. At this moment the tendency of the public opinion is to a more liberal infusion of the Democratic spirit, and the formation of a federal power, supported by a union of states, and broad enough to take in all the people of Germany. This idea has been announced in many of the public meetings of the Rhine States; and as the revolution progresses, it acquires more force. Being indefinite in the mode of its realization, this plan is interpreted to suit the views of each locality. To Poland it holds out the hope of compensation for the past wrongs she has received—it is not inconsistent with the wishes of others to establish a republic—and it presents to the monarchs of Austria, Prussia, Bavaria and Saxony, the image of an imperial crown, which may restore to Germany its ancient power, upon principles more in harmony with the spirit of modern reform.

It may be natural to a Spectator, just from the tranquil scenes of our country, to imagine that appeals to the people can be the safe resort for the efficient introduction of a system of liberty and order in the old monarchies of Europe. When he is permitted however to look in upon the terrible movements which are now presented in Berlin, he cannot but be confounded with the greatness and uncertainty of the issue. Yesterday, after the date of my Despatch, the Poles who had been confined and sentenced for political offences, being set free by the enclosed Proclamation of His Majesty,¹¹ were borne in triumph to the palace amidst the huzzas of countless masses. Without any of his ancient guards, defenceless as the poorest malefactor of the prisons, it was melancholy to look at the King obliged to present himself, and see the gathering of spirits which an accident, in word or action, may make his executioners. Every moment gives fearful strength to this unregulated power. The withdrawal of the army, the flight of those who fear the incendiary and the robber, make room for the accession of much larger numbers, who come in from the surrounding country, attracted by the desire to take part in the revolution or to gratify an awakened curiosity.

The King is however in the hands of the national guard, and he seems to possess a sufficient hold upon their good will to justify the belief that, whatever may be the concessions necessary to restore order, the lightening of the revolution will be turned from his head.

12 o'clock.

Since writing the above, a new Proclamation is out, and you will find it also enclosed.¹² The King now goes into the crowd waving the new flag of freedom, promising unconditional acceptance of the constitutional limitations which the representatives of the people may demand, putting himself ahead of the new movement, and imploring his subjects to put faith in his royal words. New flags wave over his palace. The burghers write on all the public buildings: "the people's property".

¹¹ A brief proclamation of general amnesty, March 20. More than a hundred Poles were released by it from prison in Berlin, where they had been confined on conviction for insurrection at Posen in 1846. Text in *Reden*, etc., p. 9.

¹² Proclamation of March 21. *Allgemeine Preussische Zeitung*, March 22; *Reden*, pp. 9–10; see also *Annual Register* for 1848, p. 380.

These facts show the efforts of the Burghers to master the storm. There is nothing more in the shape of concession to do, short of the destruction of the monarchy. In the mean time the army, withdrawn from the city, can no more be an actor nor a spectator in the great drama.

Tomorrow comes the great test of the strength of the appeals the King has made. The dead are to be buried. The people are to see once more the bodies of those who have fallen in their defence. The cries of the widows and the orphans are to be heard. These hundreds of bodies borne through the streets, are to pass the palace, and the King will be obliged to attend the sad ceremony in which a nation will declare its solemn protest against his orders.

3 o'clock.

I have passed through the main avenue of the city, and have seen Prince Albert,¹³ walking from the palace. He has followed the example of the King in trusting himself to the national guard, and he has been in a like manner greeted by the masses. Numerous other Proclamations are placarded in the streets, copies of which will be found enclosed.

My impression is that the crisis is passed and that it will be possible to effect a union between the military and the national guard. It is proposed by the King to bury together the dead of the soldiers and of the people. He has made a speech in which he speaks of them all as the soldiers of the same liberty, though arrayed against each other by an unfortunate accident. And the Burghers or national guards are willing to try the experiment of receiving a part of the Army at the gates of the city and permitting them to participate again in the effort to preserve order. All parties are beginning to feel the necessity of the union of the Army and the Burghers, in order to be sure that the solemn scene of tomorrow may not revive the appetite for blood. But it is necessary to secure this object that the soldiers of the Army as they reenter the city, be sworn to support the new Constitution, an oath which they will doubtless cheerfully take. After this event mens minds will return to a state of composure, and all parties will feel that it is not in the clash of arms that a new Government can be organized.

The Prince of Prussia¹⁴ is with the Troops, or at least is out of the reach of the population. He is held responsible for the conflict, and could not return to the city without being torn to pieces. As the right of succession is in him it is unfortunate that he was led to take part in the attacks upon the people. The crowd give credence to the most exaggerated statements of his efforts to keep the King from giving way. Time may possibly reinstate him; but there is a great probability that serious attempts will be made to perpetuate the succession through some other branch of the family.

6 oclock, 22d. March.

The burial of the dead has taken place, but the arrangement suggested for the fraternization of the soldiers of the king and the national guard, was not carried into effect because of the apprehension that the

¹³ Prince Albrecht of Prussia (1809-1872), youngest brother of Frederick William IV. and of William I.; cavalry general.

¹⁴ The king's brother, afterward King William I. of Prussia and German emperor; arch-conservative.

people could not yet bear the sight of the uniforms of those who had fired upon them so long a time. The dead bodies to the number of about 200 were deposited in the church of the Gendarme Place.¹⁵ They were received at 2 o'clock by citizens previously formed and grouped as mourners bearing various banners and emblems. Many hours had been previously necessary to form the order of procession, but it was at length put in motion in the slow and solemn time of the funeral chants which the Germans so well know how to make impressive. The bodies were distributed in alternate numbers so that each section of the marching column as a mourner could witness the king who stood uncovered in the balcony of the Palace, and obliged to pay his homage to each corse as it passed him. Not a soldier was to be seen. The national guard could be scarcely distinguished in the vast crowd, which after the performance of this sad duty dispersed about dark. Besides these bodies it is said that there were some 100 more who were not buried in this public manner. The dead of the Army were buried by it out of the view of Berlin.

A deputation from Breslau and Lignitz has been received by the King. The principal object of their mission is to obtain an Electoral Law similar to that by which the national Assembly in France will be chosen. The reply of the King is among the enclosed papers. He could do no more than say he would submit the subject to the Diet. He can go no further without yielding the title to the monarchy. The Proclamation calling the Diet has shortened the period to the 2d. of April, which is barely time enough to allow the members to assemble.

It is interesting to calculate the effect which may be produced by this revolution upon Poland. Many anticipate that Cracow¹⁶ will assume at once the Republican garb and that the whole of Poland will take up arms for her ancient nationality. Russia, prepared for this event, has placed her Army on the war footing, and will doubtless strike an immediate blow upon the slightest attempt against the integrity of her dominions. He¹⁷ never had faith in Louis Philippe. When told of his flight from France, he said he had rather deal with a genuine Republic, than with a monarchy neither the one nor the other. But at the same time he took the ground distinctly that he would not interfere with the Revolution if it made no attack upon him. Will he give up Poland rather than maintain a position which may make him a warrior for the fallen Monarchy of all the other states of Europe? This is the aspect events are taking: and it begins to be apparent that the Democratic tendency will claim the authority to *mediatize* some of the existing Princes,¹⁸ if such a step becomes necessary in making Monarchy subordinate to written constitution and to Federal Germany.

I have spoken to you before of the growing popularity of the idea that the German states might adopt a Government like ours. Such a project is now openly avowed in many places, to consist of an Upper House corresponding to the English House of Lords, with a House of Commons elected on a larger popular basis—an Emperor, or Presi-

¹⁵ The Gendarmenmarkt, a few squares south of Unter den Linden.

¹⁶ Cracow had been a free and independent republic from 1815 to 1846.

¹⁷ The tsar Nicholas I.

¹⁸ As in 1803, 1806, and 1815, when many of the minor German princes, previously sovereign as holding immediately of the emperor, were deprived of their sovereignty and *mediatized* by being placed under that of other sovereigns.

dent, to be elected every four years out of the number of Princes or Heads of states which may be established by their respective populations. This Federal power to take charge of the foreign relations, the import duties, coinage, navigation laws, and Post office regulations of the states which are parties to the union. In a word a Federal central Government defined as ours is by a written Constitution. Such a system, suggested in the midst of panics, and of the most astounding changes that ever occurred in Europe, will be almost accomplished if the right to make a movement in its favor be admitted. Not that it can be expected to be perfected immediately, but that as a conductor of the electricity of revolution, it will be felt as a universal good, and will acquire a prestige sufficient to protect the statesmen and patriots who will be engaged in adapting it to the true interest of Germany when the minds of men become more settled.

VI.

No. 68.

A. M. 9. o'clock. 23 March, 1848.

Sir,

The Bishop of Posen reports to the King that his authority is not maintained in that Province.¹⁹ There is of course a question of the measures proper to that emergency. Fears are also expressed that by the time the Diet can be assembled it may consider itself incompetent to represent the nation, and that thus the King may lose this intermediary in giving a legal form to the demands of the people. The military forces are in the mean time becoming uneasy. If, obeying the orders of the King, they become odious, it is easy to foresee that they must in the end follow the example of the King and take shelter under the popular cause. It is also ascertained that a new minister is to take the place of Count Arnim in the office of Foreign affairs.

March 23. 3. o'clock P. M.

I enclose you a copy of the correspondence I have had with Mr. Arnim,²⁰ the gentleman who takes the place of the count of the same name. This gentleman was the recent minister at Paris, and has probably been selected on account of his experience of the troubles there. Although liberal in his opinions, it is not however certain that he is the character which can master the increasing complications of the revolution.

The discussions of the newspapers, relieved of the censure which formerly existed, display, as was to have been expected, new causes of apprehension. One article, in particular, has produced a panic. It purports to speak the sentiment of the lower classes as distinguished from the Burghers who have been enrolled in the national guard. It insinuates that these classes have not yet had their rights. The vagueness of their demands created the fear that a practical organization of the party of the communists had been effected. The consequence is the flight of many citizens from the city, whose fears increase as the assemblages of crowds in the various streets become frequent. My belief

¹⁹ Archbishop Przyluski came from Posen with an immense Polish deputation, to represent the demands of the Prussian Poles.

²⁰ Heinrich Alexander, Freiherr von Arnim (1798-1861), minister of foreign affairs March 21-June 20, 1848; not closely related to his predecessor.

is that there is no cause for such alarm, and that what is seen is but the natural effect of the withdrawal of restraints.

11 o'clock at night.

It is impossible to describe the agitation of the city. About a hundred armed men are in front of my dwelling who say that they are sent by the authority in command of the watch to leave a guard at the houses of the foreign ministers. As I cannot suppose the republican flag in need of such protection, I ascribe the movement to the desire of some other families in the same building. I occupy the 1st floor—Count Lerchenfeldt the 2d—an aid of the Prince of Prussia, the 3d—and the chambellan of the Princess another wing of the same house. Two armed men are left at each set of apartments. If such a precaution has been generally taken in the city, it is enough of itself to frighten all those citizens who can conveniently depart; and I doubt not that such will be the case if the guards continue to spread an apprehension otherwise so natural.

As I have been brought to my writing table at this late hour of the night, I will continue some of the reflections which are suggested by the extraordinary events that are passing. Ever since my arrival in Europe, I have been in a state of amazement at the confidence which seemed to inspire the councils of its monarchs. At the opening session of the last Diet which assembled here, when this King, surrounded by such men as Humboldt, declared that he would never permit a written constitution to exist between God and his people,²¹ I almost doubted the evidence of my senses. I felt that, if such a sentiment could be hailed by the applauses of an enlightened assembly, the hope was faint indeed of seeing the condition of Europe ameliorated by the example of the American system of liberty—yet the conviction could not be abandoned that there was a feeling in the German community which sympathised with our doctrines, and that it would soon make itself felt in the councils of Kings. Hence I have watched with profound interest the agitation of all the surrounding countries, which has not surprized me by the track it has taken, altho. it has been more sudden, and threatens to be more destructive, than was anticipated. In less than one year the King can scarcely retain his seat on the throne. The standing army, which, I have so often said, if seen in any American city, in time of peace, would produce a revolution, has been obliged to fly from Berlin; and even foreign ministers do not feel easy if seen in the streets attended by their *liveried* servants.

So wonderful a change has never been exhibited to the world. It is pregnant with great consequences, and must produce combinations political and social that will be felt every where.

The general peace of 1815 was, on the part of all the European states, a compromise with the French revolution, Russia alone excepted. Monarchy was preserved, but with the understanding that it must be limited. The Holy Alliance became a kind of guaranty for the principle of intervention, by which the power of all the states were pledged to resist any attempt to alter the balance of interests then established. Thus secured, the monarchs went to work to repair the damages of war, but they adhered to its precautions, preserved large standing armies, and instead of withdrawing the restrictions which experience proved to

²¹ In his celebrated address to the United Prussian Diet at its first meeting, April 11, 1847.

be inconsistent with the developements of peace and civilization, they distrusted the people, and run into the error of supposing that their strength and safety consisted in strengthening the principle of intervention and forming new personal alliances with each other. Thus Louis Philippe courted the influence of Russia, and Prussia and Austria misled by the same feeling thought it their policy to keep out danger from the East, or to adopt the doctrines of the Emperor Nicholas. England in the mean time pursued her commercial aggrandizement in the East Indies, confident when the day of reaction overwhelmed the states of Europe that her position should be that of neutrality and ability to fill up with her manufactures the vacuum which a general war might make. Such is the present condition of Europe. Her capital flies to England—her manufactories languish—her shipping decreases—her commerce falls before the level of war—her state stocks lose their value—and all the Governments, whether revolutionized into republics or remodelled as monarchies, will find their expenditures greater than their revenues, and they will meet unregulated masses crying for work and bread ready to confound their efforts to establish order.

In the face of this state of facts stands Russia, able to combine her resources without regard to the other portions of Europe, and to control that mysterious power possessed by the Slave race during all the changes of the last 5 centuries. Extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, this sovereignty, as impenetrable as the ice of its mountains, stretches its arms into all the civilization of the world: and the other nations of Europe, instead of uniting their interests for the purpose of defence against it, have given it Poland and the doors of the Baltic and the Mediterranean. It is now felt too that the type of this Slave race in its progress to civilization, was Poland—and that she must possess again her nationality before the other nations of Europe can have a guarantee of peace. It is true that Russia was the active agent in the partition of that Kingdom, because it was her influence that was to be appeased, but France, Austria, England and Prussia permitted it, when they might have prevented it. They all now see that the atoning vengeance which that crime against humanity calls for, if it falls upon the party permitting, and not upon that committing it, will not be less just—That it is in this manner Providence punishes nations as well as individuals, when they permit that which it is their duty to prevent; and that if the instrument of justice is the apparent author of the crime, it is not the less to be respected.

My impression then of the present revolutionary movement in Europe, as an effort to extend liberty, is, that it brings into direct conflict the Germanic and French races, and the Slave race—that Russia will regard it as an attack upon her—and that the indispensable condition of its success is that Poland shall be reinstated as a nation. Poland possesses twenty millions of people, and is the lever by which the great bulk of the Russians may be pacified or neutralized, so far as civilization is concerned. But as I do not think it probable that the Emperor Nicholas will agree to retrace his steps as a party to the Partition Treaty, war seems to me inevitable—first by Poland, where the republican flag will be again raised—and then generally by the friends of reform, who will be anxious to defend Germany against the further extension of the Russian empire.

12 O'clock. March 25th.

The great event of to day is the abdication of the King of Bavaria, in favor of his son.²² Affairs here are more settled, so much so that the King of Prussia has visited Pots-dam, from which place he has issued a proclamation appointing Count Arnim his Commissioner to open the new diet. The King has paid all the pawns of the poor below five dollars, and has done much in other respects to alleviate individual distress. In this manner the public temper is wisely conciliated. If this had been the reliance, instead of the use of arms against the people, the willingness manifested to limit the monarchy, and make it subordinate to the general will of the German Nation in favor of a Federal Government for all the States of Germany, would have placed the King in a most enviable position as the friend of a great reform. As matters stand he will have competitors for this distinction; and will have given a considerable momentum to a Republican party, which if not successful in one sense of the term, will have a powerful influence in making the new Government.

As evidence of the consideration which is now paid to the United States I mention the fact that two applications have been made to me for our Federal Constitution to be put into the hands of two gentlemen, one of whom I know to have the confidence of this Government.

VII.

No. 69.

BERLIN, March 28th, 1848.

Sir,

Since my last, No. 68, Berlin has exhibited no violent opposition to the civil authorities, but the aspect and tone of its society are entirely changed. The streets and public places, freed from the soldiery, are filled with animated throngs, who discuss freely the public policy, and avail themselves of the absence of all restrictions upon the press, which is subjecting to its salutary examination the conduct of the government. Many deputations have arrived from the provinces, which demand immediate access to the King. They state with boldness the wishes of the people; and in some instances call for the dismissal of two members of the present cabinet, the counts Arnim and Schwerin.²³

But the most important occurrences of the last two days, are the petitions from Posen (Polish) for a separate government, the application from the Duchies of Sleswick Holstein for a Prussian army in support of its wish to secede from Denmark; and the appointment of delegates to the congress at Frankfort to consider the measures proper to secure to Germany unity and safety. A member of the Russian legation here has also told me this evening that the Emperor Nicholas had an army of 300,000 men near the Prussian frontier.

This last event is most important as an indication of the extreme measures which will be adopted by Russia to overwhelm Poland, if the revolutionary movement, so successful every where else, is attempted there. It confirms the probability, expressed in my last despatch, that there will be war. Russia has also an interest in favor of Denmark which will doubtless be exerted to put down the effort of Sleswick to attach itself to the Germanic Confederation, and there is strong rea-

²² King Ludwig I., giving place to King Maximilian II.

²³ Baron Arnim is meant, not count (see notes 10 and 20); and Graf Schwerin, Kultusminister March 19-June 13.

son for believing that Sweden and Norway will be found acting with Russia in this contest.

In the Austrian part of Poland, the feeling for a separate Government is stronger than it is in the Prussian part: and although it may not be gratified, neither the Emperor of Austria nor the King of Prussia has now the power to arrest the reforms which these Provinces will obtain in common with all the other Germanic States. This of itself will be depositing on that frontier an influence which Russia will deem dangerous, and which, in the present state of the political relations of these three Kingdoms, cannot but produce collision. The Poles who were recently liberated here were in fact to be punished rather for what was intended against Russian, than Prussian jurisdiction.

Austria and the Rhine States of Germany having declined to participate in the Congress proposed by the King at Dresden or Potsdam, give, in this manner, a very expressive indication of the distrust which is felt of the power of Prussia. Yet the latter has determined to send a commissioner or delegate to the assembly at Frankfort. The gentleman named is Professor Tahlmann [Dahlmann] of Bonn, who has been distinguished for his support of liberal principles, which lost him, some years since, the patronage of the King of Hanover.²⁴

This Government has not yet made public its decision upon the application recently made by the committee from Cologne who object to the constitution of the Diet, which the King has convoked for the 2d of April. They desire a Diet to be chosen on the largest suffrage basis; and are understood to have connected with it a demand for the formation of a Ministry more in accordance than the present with the public opinion. If this committee are not disappointed, and I do not see that they will be, Prussia will have been transformed in the brief period of a week from an absolute monarchy into a state almost as free as any one of the United States, as far as words can secure such a blessing. But although such may be the phases of the revolution, we cannot suppose, even if there be no war to interfere with the existing sentiment of the country, that the constitution which will be formed, will not be at least a continuation of power in the hands of the King and nobility, as great as that possessed by the English crown. If this be the fruit of this revolution, it will be a glorious era in German history. Accomplished without a free press, without a periodical legislative representation, and without the habitudes of public discussion and in the face of the best disciplined standing army in the world, it is a high guaranty that the future will witness the rapid attainment of all that is necessary to give to the institutions of Germany solidity and freedom.

It is to be remarked however that all speculation upon the influence of present events on the immediate relations of the German States to each other, must be unsatisfactory for some period to come. The wish for a Federal government strengthens. This system, so difficult in its completion with us, is complicated by a thousand obstructions here, from which we were free. These states have always had a monarchy or a power equivalent to one. Monarchs are yet on their thrones, and however unpopular they may be in some instances they have connexions

²⁴ F. C. Dahlmann (1785-1860), the celebrated historian, banished from Hanover by King Ernest Augustus in 1837, called to Bonn by Frederick William IV. in 1842.

with the property, rights and habitudes of the people, which would be thrown into great confusion by a system immediately displacing them. Yet to give sufficient effect to a Federal government demands the almost entire suppression of monarchy, particularly if the attempt to establish it commences when the political atmosphere is charged with the excitement of the French revolution, the pervading spirit of which is to found on the ruins of monarchy a republic entirely democratic. The progress and prestige of such a system, when it is once started, will be a triumph over the opposite, which cannot be expected to submit quietly. Here then is a cause of war, which, if Russia were not to interfere, is enough to involve in utter uncertainty the issue of the present agitation in Europe. In this aspect of affairs it would be doubtless the true policy of the Congress at Frankfort to propose only such general measures as are necessary to unite the German States in a plan of common defence, leaving for future arrangement the formation of the proposed Federal Government. Stopping now at this point France will have the opportunity to put into execution her new government, and assured of the friendship of Germany, her people will be more sensible of their responsibility to the world; and it may be hoped that the anarchy with which they are threatened will disappear in the progress of their work. A moral force may be thus combined which even Russia will be willing to respect, and it may thus be possible to restore to unfortunate Poland her independence with the consent of the parties who dismembered her.

There never was such a field open to the patriot statesman and soldier of Europe. A character more like Washington than the great Frederick, is wanted to give coherence and unity to the noble movement of Germany. A genius equal to Napoleon, but without his ambition, is necessary to conduct the military operations, if Russia's army of a million is poured into the centre of Europe. The cause will not be that of Dynasties but of liberty and free institutions, and the patriotism to secure it a triumph, must be as far ahead of that of the 30 years war, or the French revolution, as the civilization of the present, is ahead of that of those periods. I thank God that our beloved country is not an immediate actor in these events, but is imparting by her example a moral support which is equally effective, and which, if not now sufficient to command the victory, will ultimately give it to the friends of liberty and reform.

P. S. I enclose duplicate of my correspondence with Monsieur d'Arnim.

VIII.

No. 70.

BERLIN, March 30th, 1848.

Sir,

I have translated the document submitted by the Deputation from the Rhine Provinces of Prussia to the King, and his reply thereto, which I enclose for your perusal.²⁵ It is a fair expression of the new thought of Germany. Relieved of the presence of the standing army, and possessed of the freedom of the press, and the right of meeting together to discuss questions of public interest, the people of Berlin remind one of those of New York on the eve of an election. Their public school

²⁵ Address, Cologne, March 24; king's reply, Potsdam, March 28, *Reden*, pp. 16-17.

system, more practical and universal than that of any other in Europe, is now exhibiting its fruit; and it is gratifying to see how it concurs with those of rail roads and telegraphs to strengthen the reforms which are necessary to break down the barriers raised by the errors of former ages. I have not attended any of these public meetings, but have been told by some Americans who have, that they are conducted with order, and that speakers are found in the classes of the tradesmen and mechanics, who are capable of comprehending the great movement of the age, and of inspiring their comrades with the determinations which are necessary to secure their civil and religious freedom. The King in the mean time is powerless. Disarmed as by magic of his guards, and of the ceremonial which gave so much apparent splendor and dignity to his Court, he sees disappear as a dream all that mystic inheritance which he has received from his Fathers, and by which he has believed that his authority was of divine right. Highly instructed, sincerely pious, a discriminating patron of merit, he has been still unable to comprehend the force of the great moral truth that all men are born free and equal—and that they can confer no political distinction or power which is divine—that if they have heretofore acquiesced in Governments which they did not constitute, their governors, however named, possessed no title so sacred as that of the superior right of the people themselves to establish their own institutions. The queen also, the worthy partner of the King, contributes by her very goodness to strengthen this veil of mysticism. She makes her palace the hospital of the wounded, there is not an institution for the relief of the poor in the Kingdom, which has not been benefitted by her charity, and all classes of her subjects recognise in her retired influence a steady protection of morality and peace. Should not such virtues as these reconcile my people to the House of the Hohenzollern? This is the excited thought of the King. He sees not that other thought which imbodyes the people in the support of a just political principle, and before which his personal merits, whatever they may be, must sink in the great tide of events, and float with it. He cannot comprehend that these virtues, at the time when they are most conspicuous, are designed by Providence to illustrate the advent of a reform which is to give Europe better governments and a better people—an era in which absolutism falls, not that Kings are bad men, but that the system is no longer suited to the wants of society.

Sir Strafford [Stratford] Canning, the English ambassador to Constantinople, has taken this city in his route.²⁶ He had an interview with the King yesterday: and was doubtless instructed by his government to state the policy which Great Britain would pursue in reference to the present agitation in Germany. A monarchy formed on the English model may be supposed to have been suggested as the resting place for Prussia: but it is less easy to define the change which will be effected in that model by the growing disposition for the United States of Germany, and the auxiliary tendencies to republicanism supplied by the American example, as well as by the present experiment in France. It is now more fashionable to call for our Federalist and Constitution than for any thing British as a form of government. But the fact is that England is not so much interested in this political transformation of Ger-

²⁶ Minister to the United States 1820-1823, ambassador in Constantinople 1825-1829, 1841-1858.

many as she is in its commercial effects; and it is rather in this point of view that we may understand her position in the troubled waters of the continent. A United States of Germany with a strong federal government, exercising exclusively the rights to lay taxes on foreign imports, and performing the other general functions in respect to the interior and exterior defence, may do much to lessen the control which England has heretofore exercised on the continent by her commercial intercourse. A distrust derived from this cause made her unwilling to see the Zollverein extended. Her influence was paramount at the Hanse Towns, which nothing but a revolution like the present can ever attach to a system that will make them German sea ports. Hence it may be supposed that a successful union of the German states, with a Federal Government, regulating their navigating and foreign commercial intercourse, will not be aided by British influence. A union with less power associating the states for military defence, and breaking down only the barriers in the interior to a free circulation—in other words without the power to pass general discriminating and protective duties—would better suit her manufacturing ascendancy in the present markets of the continent. Our interest on the contrary is in harmony with our political sympathies. With a United States of Germany, possessing a federal authority, we can make better Treaties, and can calculate upon a larger commercial intercourse than we can with the same states regulated by independent systems. If as a whole these states adopt a protective or discriminating law, it will not be operative against us. It will be intended to increase the direct trade with us. If as a whole they adopt the free trade system, we shall still have an advantage over any European nation, because we have the raw productions and can sell them cheaper than any other nation: and our shipping can compete with that of any other.

Hence I infer, less from Mr Cannings visit, than from the evident interest of Great Britain, that the Congress which will be charged with the question of a German parliament, or Federal Government for Germany, will encounter serious opposition from foreign causes.

March 31st.

A most important decree was yesterday sanctioned by the King which you will see in the enclosed paper.²⁷ It establishes the responsibility of the Ministers and was so self evident a necessity, that we have all been astonished by its delay. Under the old regime the King united in himself all the functions legislative and executive. The consequence was that Ministers were cyphers. No act could be done without the King's personal examination and decision, and a complaint against it was an attack upon the Royal authority. Not so now—the Ministers will receive the deputations, must make up a decision for which they will be responsible to the nation, and the Legislature may maintain its authority without the risk of agitations which attend the overthrow of the Monarch. Now the King instead of being harrassed to death by the thousand forms in which the public sentiment shews itself, can retire to his palace, and consult quietly that constitutional and legal tribunal which the people themselves will recognise as indispensable to the pres-

²⁷ Decree of March 30. The paper enclosed is the *Königlich privilegirte Berlinische Zeitung* of April 1; see also *Reden*, p. 18.

ervation of order and the administration of justice. A government is in fact forced into existence, although provisory at present, yet fulfilling the essential character of the one in France. It will meet the Diet on the 2d instant with a Royal concession providing a new electoral or constituent basis for the Legislative Chambers which will as soon as possible be thereafter assembled, and which will resemble the American conventions, where fundamental changes, first proposed by delegates, are afterwards ratified by the people. These chambers will find their powers defined, in the same Chart that establishes the authority and limits of the Crown.

Simultaneous with this decree the Burghers have consented to the introduction of a part of the old army, for the purpose of assisting in the suppression of riots. It was found that the Burghers could not stand the interruption of their daily business caused by their duties as a permanent guard. All classes, Barons, Counts and noblemen, have been reduced by the events of the 18th of March to the same level with the common citizen. A nobleman worth a million has been seen by the side of the poor man, keeping the watch, and marching under the orders of some militia sergeant or corporal to the post of duty. The permanent effect of all this will be an armed and national militia, the subordination of arms to the authority of the magistrate, and the gradual formation of a public opinion capable of appreciating and defending free institutions.

I am gratified to state to you these symptoms of returning order. How far they may be interrupted by the deliberations at Frankfort, where the influence of the king of Prussia has been lessened by his unwise delay in granting reforms, time alone can determine. Or how far all present calculations may be upset by the growing feeling in favor of a Republic, no one can foresee. The prestige of Monarchy has fallen. Hereafter it will be subordinate to limited constitutions, but at the same time the separate nationalities will retain their separate prejudices, and it is not to be supposed that they will be ready to make the sacrifices and compromises which are necessary to a safe and powerful union for the common defence.

It is my aim in the present excitement, to keep myself out of the contest, but not to mistake the prevailing influences, or to withhold friendly suggestions where I see an opportunity to aid the cause of national²⁸ reform and liberty. I will give you a faithful account of all that I do, and of the measures which may seem to me proper to secure to the United States their just participation in the benefits of the great revolution.

²⁸ "Rational" in the draft.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

The Golden Days of the Early English Church from the Arrival of Theodore to the Death of Bede. By Sir HENRY H. HOWORTH, K.C.I.E., D.C.L., F.R.S., F.S.A., President of the Royal Archaeological Institute and Trustee of the British Museum. In three volumes. (New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. 1917. Pp. cxciv, 384; viii, 517; viii, 443. \$15.00.)

"It was many years ago", writes Sir Henry Howorth in the preface to his latest work, "when I used to discuss early English history with Mr. Freeman . . . that I formed the intention of some time trying to analyse its early sources and to unriddle its difficulties and obscurities in greater accordance with modern scientific methods than do some popular guides". Sir Henry soon discovered, however, that before the civil history of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms could be written, it would be necessary to explore more thoroughly the ecclesiastical history of the age. "This, then, explains the object and purpose with which, at the close of an exceptionally strenuous life . . . I have written five volumes of closely packed matter dealing with the beginnings of the English Church during less than a century and a half of its early career."

The first of these five volumes, a biography of *Saint Gregory the Great*, appeared in 1912. This was followed the next year by a life of *Augustine the Missionary*. The remaining three volumes have been published during the present year (1917) and profess to carry forward the narrative of early English church history "from the arrival of Theodore to the death of Bede". This period the author calls for no very evident reason *The Golden Days of the Early English Church*. It was no doubt an age of much missionary enthusiasm and constructive effort along Christian lines; but it was also a period of much pagan resistance without the new church and much pagan influence within; and, if we are to believe Bede, the closing years of this "golden age" gave evidence that the earlier fervor had passed away.

There can be no quarrel with the author's statement that his volumes are closely packed: they contain a vast amount of information, most of which appears to be reliable. But that the matter always relates to the history of the English church is not so evident; and it may also be doubted whether the work is in real accord with scientific methods. One is amazed to find that three volumes aggregating more than 1500 pages have been written about the Church in England during the years

from 669 to 735; but on closer examination it is found that Sir Henry's narrative is not so extended as it appears to be. About one-third of the first volume is made up of a lengthy preface and a somewhat longer introduction in which the author gives a critical discussion of the sources of the period under examination. The greater part of the third volume is given over to a series of extensive appendixes, notes, and corrections, and an index. Furthermore, the narrative of the first volume is largely introductory and deals with the generation before the coming of Theodore. If we were also to eliminate the materials that may be regarded as of doubtful relevance, the work would be reduced to quite reasonable limits. No doubt the student of Anglo-Saxon times should know the contemporary history of the Byzantine Empire and of the Frankish kingdom; perhaps conditions in England in the seventh century may be rendered more intelligible by a study of the monastic rules of Saint Basil, Saint Cassian, and others, or by accounts of the debates and decrees of church councils in Spain, Rome, and Constantinople; but ordinarily one does not look for all this information in the history of the missionary activities in far-away England. It is at best difficult to tell the story of the involved relations of the Old English kingdoms; but when a writer digresses as far and as freely as Sir Henry does, his account becomes very confusing.

A graver fault than the author's mode of presentation is a tendency to state a probability and later to treat this probability as an established fact. In discussing the marriage of Eadbald of Kent to his step-mother Bertha, Sir Henry concludes: "It would seem more probable that he apostatised, and possibly did so in order to marry Bertha" (I. 241). On the next page we read again of Eadbald and Bertha, "to secure whose hand he is said to have apostatised". In his account of the division of the bishopric of East Anglia by Archbishop Theodore, the author states his belief that "to this date . . . we may with every probability assign the remains of a primitive church, which still exist at South Elmham" (I. 310). Then follows a detailed description of this church closing with the following remark: "So much for the church founded by Theodore at South Elmham" (I. 316).

Sir Henry Howorth's long labors in this rather barren field have, however, not been wholly fruitless. His conclusions, though often based on flimsy or very slight evidence, are always interesting and often of real importance. He minimizes the importance of the Roman mission in the first half of the seventh century and places the emphasis where it seems to belong, on the activities of Saint Aidan and his Celtic associates. Though King Oswy at the synod of Whitby finally declared for the Roman view with respect to the Easter controversy, he continued faithful to the Celtic priesthood and a "persistent opponent of the Italian Church". Sir Henry also holds that the Celtic influence in the English Church persisted long after the debate at Whitby.

The work is naturally concerned very largely with the careers of the

great saints and churchmen of the age, Saint Oswald, Theodore of Tarsus, Saint Wilfrid, Saint Aldhelm, Saint Cuthbert, and the Venerable Bede. With the coming of Archbishop Theodore, Sir Henry believes an important Greek element was added to the ecclesiastical system of the Angles. With Saint Wilfrid and his ultramontane principles the author shows little sympathy; he also assumes a very critical attitude toward the work of Æddi, Wilfrid's famous biographer. For the Venerable Bede and his great history Sir Henry has profound respect; but he is inclined to believe that on several important points the great historian was in error, and that certain parts of the *Ecclesiastical History* in its present form were probably not written by Bede but are later interpolations.

In tracing the careers of the early English saints Sir Henry does not stop with their departure from this life but continues with lengthy accounts of their relics and the miracles that these are said to have performed. Thus about twenty pages are devoted to "the fate and doings of Oswald's remains after his death", and at least fifty to similar tales from the story of Saint Cuthbert. The reviewer wishes to question the propriety of filling the pages of what professes to be sober history with legendary materials; still, he appreciates the force of the author's retort that those who ignore the history of relics and "their reputations as magical and medieval remedies . . . fail to understand the very large place these things filled in the minds and imaginations of their ancestors in the seventh century".

LAURENCE M. LARSON.

Giordano Bruno: his Life, Thought, and Martyrdom. By WILLIAM BOULTING. (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner, and Company, Ltd.; New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. 1916. Pp. viii, 315. \$3.75.)

It is not an exaggeration to say that in the writings of Giordano Bruno, one of the most amazingly fertile of thinkers, are to be found the germs of all subsequent vital philosophic thought. But so saturated are his writings with the peculiar qualities of his impetuous personality that no cold rationalism may serve adequately to understand him. Sympathetic appreciation is here indispensable. Notable, then, is this book, not only because of its subject, but also because unmistakably its preparation and writing have been a work of solicitude of the heart as well as solicitude of the mind.

The book is admirable both in its plan and in its execution. There are chapters that deal with Bruno's birth and parentage, with his boyhood, and with his monastic life in the south; there is a satisfactory account of his early reading (in the classics, in the scholastics, in the Neo-Platonists, and in the writings of contemporary thinkers) and of his first wanderings, which were an inevitable consequence of that reading;

a chapter is devoted to an analysis of the budding philosophy of his early works; the renewed wanderings are recounted; the seven books printed in London are explained; the further travels are retold; the final books are outlined; and then the trial and death of the restless and daring thinker are described. Thus the reader is given the biographical details of Bruno's life in their chronological order, and the analyses of his various books are presented in the most appropriate places, the respective periods of his life in which the books were written. The pathetic story of the troubled life, with its brief sojourns in capitals and at courts, in academic centres and in theological citadels, is told with subtle and suggestive sympathy; while the careful and skillful dissections of the books reveal the difficult process the author has spared his readers but would not spare himself. It is these things that constitute the chief value of the book—the veracity and sufficiency of the biographical detail, the unusual expository power, and the singularly sympathetic understanding of the man and his thought.

The faults of the book, which is at once the story of an age and a soul, are few, and most of them are superficial. Bruno is constantly described as a monk, whereas, of course, he was a friar. All the Anti-Trinitarianism of southern Italy is labelled as Arianism, whereas its tenets were surprisingly diverse. It is stated that Bruno influenced the thought of Spinoza, but one could wish that a brief though definite exposition of the character and consequences of that influence had been given. It would have been well had Bruno's position as the first of modern pantheistic thinkers been made clear. Some attention is paid to Bruno's style. We are informed that his impassioned prose reveals his personal characteristics, and that frequently, when the thought is unusually daring, poetry invades his pages. But the fact that he was the first writer to restore the artistic form of philosophy has been left unnoticed. And surely this is a service not to be forgotten. The long dominion of the scholastic architectonics, the twilight of the mystic rhapsodies, and the enervation of the humanistic dilettantism, had left the philosophy that was at once rational and imaginative in need of a style in which matter and form are organically related. Bruno was the first artistic philosopher of the modern world, a type of which Plato remains the supreme example, and it is only just that this position should be recognized and acknowledged. Andreas Osiander, the theologian who surreptitiously inserted an anonymous preface in the great work of Copernicus, is ambiguously described as a "priest". And the usefulness of the book would have been greatly increased had it been provided with a critical bibliography of the literature relating to Bruno. This omission is all the more regrettable in that the author frequently shows wide and intelligent reading in that literature.

By a marvellous sweep of the imagination, Bruno, for the first time, and without the aid of the confirmatory evidence subsequently furnished by Galileo, extended the Copernican theory to all the hosts of heaven.

He declared that the physical universe stretches as far as infinity and is eternal in its duration. And he even dimly guessed at Newton's great discovery. From this conception of the cosmos he was inevitably impelled to a new philosophy, and, indeed, to a new religion. The universe, which can neither increase nor decrease, whose constituent things change their aspects in ceaseless flux but are never extinguished, receives unity from a soul immanent in every wayside flower, in the most distant star, and in the heart of man. With this infinite and eternal spirit man is actually and veritably one. Why, then, whatever vicissitudes of change he may suffer, should he fear death? Unending progress is his only prospect. This was the philosophy that all the theologies of the time banned with equal disapprobation.

Bruno and his work are clearly revealed and described in this book. The importunate personality, the intrepid zeal for truth, the relentless reason, the synthetic thought, the soaring imagination, and the flamboyant eloquence—all these things have been understood with unerring instinct and unfolded with loving and intelligent explicatory labor. We have here the whole of the man and the thinker, a glint of each facet of his varied genius. All through his life Bruno burned with the fire of a wild spirit, and in his tragic death he burned in a flame that was not more ardent. But he had done his work. With his winged thought he had pierced the fixed firmament of the scholastic heavens. And he had helped to transpose religion from the perishing realm of creeds and dogmas into the undying domain of feeling and aspiration.

EDWARD MASLIN HULME.

Akbar, the Great Mogul, 1542-1605. By VINCENT A. SMITH, M.A., M.R.A.S. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1917. Pp. xv, 504. \$6.40.)

THE author of this book has had the good fortune to be the biographer of the most eminent rulers in India. In 1901 he published the life of Asoka; in 1904 the history of Alexander's campaign in India; and now he gives us his long-planned *Akbar*, happily delayed, for since Mr. Smith first spoke of the importance of such a work, twenty years ago, materials for Akbar's life have accumulated. A few years since appeared the memoirs of Manucci; in 1906 was found the long-lost manuscript of Father Monserrate, a Jesuit visitor at Akbar's court; besides which have been published a reliable edition of Jahangir's memoirs and other less weighty but still valuable authorities.

The prime source for Akbar's life and times will always be the court chronicle of Abu'l-Fazl, but that courtier's *Akbarnama* is always discreetly hazy when his master's character is affected. The records of less fulsome flatterers, foreign and native, are therefore indispensable both for this biography and for the *Ain-i-Akbari* or Institutes of Akbar, which the same courtier with the help of a staff of attendants compiled

under the emperor's supervision.¹ Mr. Smith has also drawn upon a store of archaeological facts hitherto not utilized.

To the meticulous historian the most valuable part of the present life will be the rectification of dates, to the general reader the estimate of Akbar's character and of the economic and religious reforms instituted by him.

Akbar, whom careless writers have called an Indian and even "an Indian of the Indians", was half Persian, quarter Turk, and quarter Mongolian.² He was born November 23, 1542 (officially registered as October 15).³ His name, Jalalu'd-Din (Muhammed) Akbar, he afterwards utilized to his spiritual glory in such a way as to imply that he was divine, Akbar being the title of God. At the age of seven months, says Abu'l-Fazl, he revealed a "mystery of God's power" to his nurse. Other miracles also haloed the child, who in later years asserted that he "remembered perfectly" what took place when he was one year old. Oddly enough Mr. Smith accepts this as a fact and explains it as due to Akbar's "exceptionally powerful memory". But children often "remember" (from later years) what has been repeated to them since they could really remember.

Akbar was crowned ("enthroned") February 14, 1556 (another disputed date), at a time when war and famine had devastated the land and his adherents were few, a Hindu general and other rivals disputing his claim to the kingdom. Kabul was independent; Bengal had been so for two hundred years; the Rajasthan princes of the west held unchallenged possession of their lands; Malwa and Gujarat had long since defied Delhi.⁴ To Akbar remained a little territory in the Punjab and a few adherents. The fourteen-year-old boy won his first battle, pressed on to Delhi, and after a brief period of boyish indifference awoke to the sense of power. Hitherto he had been under a Protector. This Bismarck he soon told to "make the pilgrimage to Mecca", and at the age of eighteen took the kingdom into his own hands. Like Alexander he delighted in feats of bravado, slaying a tigress with his own hand, racing a mad elephant over a bridge of boats, and even "fighting his sword", by running into its point, though he was probably drunk at the time, for, like all his family, he was apt to drink too much as well

¹ Akbar could neither read nor write but nothing escaped him in his court chronicles; in fact his life was revised by himself.

² He was descended from Tamerlane, but also from Chingiz Khan, on his father's side; his mother was a Persian. In ferocity a Turk, in physiognomy Mongolian, in education and culture a Persian, he was Indian only in accepting Hindu civilization and in recognizing Hindus as deserving of high office in the state.

³ See on this point *Indian Antiquary*, November, 1915. Most authorities give the wrong date, following Abu'l-Fazl. Mr. Smith settles the point definitively.

⁴ Akbar treated Agra rather than Delhi as his capital but Delhi generally represents the state. Fathpur Sikri, "Akbar's city", was built for a whim and abandoned for the same cause.

as to take opium. One of the boy-emperor's first appointments was that of a (heterodox) Shia to the office of chief justice, a significant appointment in that it foreshadowed his later repudiation of orthodox Muhammedanism.

Space forbids an extended survey of Akbar's exploits. Suffice to say that at the climax of his career (1581) he ruled all India (as far as he knew), to Ahmednagar, to Kabul, to the hither side of Baluchistan, and to the western sea. At this period he thought himself more than man and discarded one by one the religions he had previously affected, Zoroastrianism (1578), Christianity (1581), as well as the Hindu and Jain faiths. To each he had shown such favor that each regarded him as a convert, when he suddenly proclaimed his own religion, an eclectic monotheism tintured with sun-worship, pantheism, and (Jain) antipathy to eating meat. The shibboleth of his own religion, *Allahu Akbar*, means either "God is great" or "Akbar is God", and the doubtful meaning represented the furtive ambition of the emperor who dared not openly proclaim himself divine.

To Akbar's credit he insisted that no Hindu woman should be forced to commit suttee. His economic reforms are accepted at their face value by modern Hindus who like to contrast his taxes with those of the English Raj. Mr. Smith thinks that the system of revenue adopted by Akbar was a grievous failure resulting in "shocking oppression". The empire was administered by officers directly responsible to Akbar instead of the Jagirdars of former emperors. This saved much "hand-greasing", but the peasants were still robbed and even sold for taxes. Akbar was the richest monarch in the world. At his death he left in hard cash a sum which Mr. Smith estimates as the equivalent of two hundred million pounds sterling. The peasants whose wealth made his were not treated too easily. He was always a Turk, vindictive, relentless to brave but conquered foes, an assassinator by proxy, fond of brutality; but very urbane and courteous even when most treacherous.

Mr. Smith, who hides no lights under a bushel, gives himself due credit for first proclaiming Jain influence upon Akbar and for discovering that the greatest poet of India flourished under this emperor. He also says (on slender authority) that Akbar was an epileptic as well as a mystic, who, like Muhammed, saw visions. We thank the author for the reference to the Jains; we doubt the imputation of epilepsy; and we regret that Sir George Grierson's opinion of the poet Tulsi Das should have been followed so uncritically. Three stanzas are cited to show that this poet did not write conventional verse. One of them is a well-known classic in modern dress! Tulsi Das wrote under Christian influence, but even were his ideas original he was certainly not "the most important figure in the whole of Indian literature". In short, we prefer Mr. Smith's judgment in chronology to his obiter dicta regarding matters not purely historical. Thus we follow him (and will not accept other accounts) in dating Akbar's death as occurring October 27, 1605,

and his son Daniyal's death in 1604 (repudiating 1605). This Daniyal, by the way, as an example of Mogul clemency raised the former assessment of Khandesh, when it was annexed, just fifty per cent.⁵

Those interested in prices and exact dates will find Mr. Smith's analyses and computations admirably lucid. Those who skip statistics will enjoy a well-written narrative giving a clearly defined authentic picture of one of the great lords of earth, once awful and always picturesque.

E. WASHBURN HOPKINS.

The Beginnings of English Overseas Enterprise: a Prelude to the Empire. By Sir C. P. Lucas, K.C.B., K.C.M.G. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1917. Pp. 203. \$2.90.)

THERE has been much study and writing on special periods in the history of the English chartered commercial companies, but almost no attempt to give a continuous narrative of the whole career of any one of them. The work of Sir Charles Lucas, which endeavors to tell the story of three of the earliest companies, is therefore a welcome and important contribution to the literature of the subject. These three are the Merchants of the Staple, the Eastland Merchants, and the Merchant Adventurers. The first is perforce, for lack of materials, very brief, and the second a slight, almost an outline sketch; the work is therefore practically a history of the Merchant Adventurers of England from their obscure origin in the Netherlands in the fourteenth century to their dissolution, after at least four centuries of continuous existence, at Hamburg in 1808.

In this account there is much of interest concerning the affairs of the company itself, much concerning its relations to occurrences in general history. The author uses almost entirely printed sources, but among them are to be found a number of pamphlets and other materials not previously drawn upon for such uses. Although there seems little probability now that the actual records of the company will ever be discovered, there is doubtless much still in manuscript in England and abroad which will ultimately be made to throw light upon the many parts of this history which are still obscure. An actually definitive history of the Merchant Adventurers will obviously have to wait for the use of these. Sir Charles Lucas is familiar with two of Dr. Lingelbach's contributions to the subject; it is unfortunate that he does not seem to have known of his printed edition of the *Laws and Ordinances* and other documents of the Merchant Adventurers. The main document in this collection gives full insight into the organization and practice of the company at what was probably the period of its greatest extent and prosperity, the beginning of the seventeenth century.

⁵ Prices have risen 600 per cent. in India since Akbar's day. At that time an Englishman could live there, travel, and return with "something saved", for "tuppence" a day.

It is a pity that American historical work is not better known in England, since it would often serve to enrich excellent but necessarily not exhaustive English monographs. This work, for instance, is described as being written "from standard sources". Yet in the two minor essays in it, both of which are, according to the author's own statement, far from satisfactorily complete, he has not utilized and evidently has not known of the existence of Miss Jencks's careful thesis on the origin and successive locations of the Continental and domestic staples, or Miss Deardorff's study, made almost entirely from new manuscript sources, of the origin of the Eastland Company and its establishment at Elbing. This criticism is not intended in any way to derogate from the interest and significance of Sir Charles Lucas's volume. It is written with the ability and mastery of the trained historian who has contributed so much to our knowledge of the British Empire in its various aspects. It has also a wider appeal than its subject might indicate. The fact that the author feels called upon to draw a lesson from this chapter of British history, is probably one of the many reflexes of the Great War. Before the war we were satisfied, as a general thing, to study and write history for its own sake, simply as one part of the great work of the discovery and recording of knowledge. Now we feel that history should have some lesson to teach, some contribution to make to the settlement of world problems. The author's special contribution in this case is the use of his narrative as a demonstration and illustration of the continuity of the growth of the British Empire, and as a proof of the desirability of that "co-operation between state authority and private enterprise which has been the greatest of all factors in the make up of the British Empire". To this thesis the author comes back again and again, and uses it as alike the clue to the significance of the great commercial companies and a justification of the empire.

It may be worth while to point out, however, that the overseas empire of which these companies were the actual beginning was a trading not a colonial empire; and that it reached its culmination by the close of the sixteenth century, before the first permanent colony of England had been founded or acquired. By that date there were English companies holding extensive rights by charter from their own government and concessions from the governments of the countries in which they traded, in Russia, Poland, Germany, Venice, Turkey, Northwest Africa, and the East Indies. It was a veritable trading domain, with its settled system and its distinctive characteristics. The temporary sojourn of its merchants in these foreign countries, the system of agents and apprentices, the problems of individual trading of its employees, the joint stock that was, in most places, established from the beginning or early developed, the meetings and self-government of its members abroad, the national diplomacy that these trading relations necessitated, all marked a distinctive type of external empire, based on trade, not on either colonization or control of territories outside of England. The

beginnings of colonization came later as an offshoot and almost as a casual development from the trading empire.

EDWARD P. CHEYNEY.

Documents relating to Law and Custom of the Sea. Edited by R. G. MARSDEN. Volume II., 1649-1767. [Publications of the Navy Records Society, vol. L.] (London: Printed for the Navy Records Society. 1917. Pp. xxxiii, 457.)

THE present volume, like its predecessor, is in large part made up of extracts from original records, particularly those of the prize courts. The editor states that the prize records are in a fair state of preservation, but that, as they were framed in the same bare and technical terms and contained little beyond the bald order of condemnation or of restitution of the ship or goods, they are disappointing as regards the light which they might have been expected to throw upon the growth of prize law. Sometimes, as we had occasion to remark concerning the previous volume, one may wish that the entire text, instead of an extract, of a certain record had been given, since even formal recitals may now and then convey, when read in connection with a judgment, a meaning more readily discoverable by an expert in our subject than by an expert in another. The editor, however, prints the full text of a considerable number of orders in council, of letters of marque and reprisal, of royal instructions to men-of-war and privateers, and of other and cognate documents; and he reproduces from the printed text in the *Collectanea Juridica* (I. 133) the celebrated report of the British law officers, Sir George Lee, Dr. Paul, Sir Dudley Ryder, and the solicitor general, W. Murray, afterwards Lord Mansfield, on the case of the Silesian loan.

We have more than once had occasion to deprecate the widely prevalent but uninformed supposition that the questions of maritime law raised during the present great international conflict are in the mass essentially new. Even the most cursory and inexperienced perusal of the present volume should suffice to dissipate such an assumption. In respect of numerous important questions, the contents, fragmentary though they be, carry us back to a time antedating by more than a century the wars growing out of the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars.

Worthy of special notice, as indicating that present conceptions are by no means so far advanced over those of earlier times as is generally assumed, is a neutrality proclamation issued by Charles II., February 8, 1668 (p. 70), which forbids any act of hostility in English waters or any hovering there for hostile purposes, and, in case men-of-war or a man-of-war and a merchant ship, of the opposing belligerents happen to be in port at the same time, requires one of the men-of-war to be detained for two tides after the other man-of-war or the merchant ship shall have departed. A foreign privateer having prize property in its possession is forbidden to stay in port more than twenty-four hours,

unless constrained by "contrary winds, blocking up by enemies, or other distress", or to sell or leave behind prize goods. Not only are English ships that shall "victual, furnish, or recruit themselves for voyages at sea" to be detained where the "provision or furniture" is suspected "to be designed for any other than trading or fishing voyages", but English subjects are forbidden to enter the martial service of any foreign state, or to accept and execute any commission of war or letter of marque and reprisal. It is interesting to find, under date of July 5, 1712, an inquiry ordered upon a complaint of the Swedish minister that a ship fitting out at Bristol, manned with English sailors, and alleged to be an English ship bound for the Mediterranean, was in truth designed for the Czar of Muscovy.

On the other hand, as indicating that the capacity to "blow hot" and "blow cold", according to interest, is not peculiar to any age, it is curious to contrast a sentence of the Court of Admiralty, in 1653, condemning a Dutch ship for having traded at Barbados contrary to the act of October 3, 1650, which forbade foreign ships to trade with any of the English plantations or islands in America without a license from Parliament or the Council of State, with the instructions given to Captain Ming in 1662 to force a trade upon the Spanish West Indies, the trade with which the King of Spain, their sovereign, had, so the instructions declared, endeavored to engross "contrary to use and custom of all governments and the lawes of nations" (pp. 19, 41). In connection with these two documents, it is instructive to read the commission given in 1729 to a Spanish *guarda costa* (p. 270).

Several documents and extracts from documents are printed which serve to illustrate certain phases of the centuries-old controversy as to the stoppage of provisions destined to the enemy. Under date of May 17, 1665, we have a communication from the Council of State to the judges of the Admiralty urging them to treat as contraband not only naval supplies, such as canvas, masts, pitch, and tar, but "also wine, oil; brandy, fish, corn, salt, flesh, and all other things that tend as provision unto the support of life", since his Majesty would "in vain attempt the reducing of his enemies, if they shall enjoy the freedom of such unlimited supplies". The judges, it appeared, had forborne to go so far (p. 57). On June 27, 1694, the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty ordered Admiral Berkeley to send some of his ships, "together with two fire ships", to seize a number of Danish and Swedish ships, proceeding under Swedish convoy and laden with "corn, naval stores, or contraband goods", and to bring them into an English port (p. 160). Fifteen years later (April 28, 1709) an Order in Council was issued for the "stopping" and bringing into an English port of all neutral ships laden with corn and bound to France. The immediate occasion of the order was the receipt of information that there was then "great scarcity of corn" in France; and in these circumstances it was declared to be of the "highest importance . . . to distress the enemy as much as possible

by taking the most effectual methods for preventing their receiving such supplies at this juncture" (pp. 210, 211).

The next document bearing upon this question is a brief extract from an opinion of Sir Dudley Ryder and Mr. Murray (later Lord Mansfield) of May 10, 1746 (p. 323). We can only regret that the letter in which the extract was found, if it could not be textually reproduced in a foot-note, was not summarized with legal understanding and precision. Even the descriptive heading apparently betrays a misapprehension of the nature of the legal questions involved. A similar comment must be made upon the singular statement (p. 342), regarding a Dutch *placaat* of 1747 forbidding the export of "warlike and shipping stores", that the "absence" of such an order in later times led to the "armed neutrality". Nor can one help doubting whether the framers of the *placaat* would have accepted the editor's description of the list of articles, whose export was prohibited, as a "list of contraband", in the usual sense of that phrase. Again, in a foot-note to an extract from a document of 1758 (p. 382), relating to the controversy concerning the Rule of the War of 1756, the question of contraband is mentioned in a very brief summary of another document evidently relating to the same controversy. The precise sense in which the author of the second document supposed the contraband question to be involved is not disclosed. The full text of both documents probably would be very instructive.

Sentences of condemnation are produced in 1672 (p. 82), in 1695 (p. 169), in 1709 (p. 209), and in 1767 (pp. 399-400), clearly showing the belligerent character and rights attributed by the British Admiralty to non-commissioned British armed merchantmen in time of war. In conformity with the established law, their captures were condemned as prize, the condemnation being for the benefit of the crown, which then as an act of grace would remit to the captor a part or the whole of the proceeds. The case in 1767 was that of the French ship *L'Indien* taken by the East India Company's armed ship *Revenge*. After the condemnation, the crown, upon a petition of the company, setting forth that the *Revenge*, while on a voyage from Bombay to Bengal, did "attack, seize, and take" the *Indien*, carrying twenty-four guns and 225 men and laden chiefly with military stores for Mauritius, where "the French ships and forces were then assembled in order to attack the said Company's settlements", ordered "the said prize ship and cargo" to be delivered over to the company as its absolute property.

J. B. MOORE.

Freedom after Ejection: a Review (1690-1692) of Presbyterian and Congregational Nonconformity in England and Wales. Edited by ALEXANDER GORDON, M.A. [Publications of the University of Manchester, Historical Series, no. XXX.] (Manchester: University of Manchester Press, 1933.) Pp. 25. 2s. 6d.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXIII.—25.

versity Press; London: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1917. Pp. vi, 396. 15 sh.)

THE discovery in 1912 of a manuscript register of Presbyterian and Congregational ministers and churches for the years 1690-1692, brought to light a document of interest in the history of Dissent. The register—known otherwise as a “review” or a “survey”—is printed in full in this volume. It extends to 150 pages of text, and forms the principal part of the contents of the book. The editor contributes a commentary or exposition of the circumstances under which the survey was made and used. But his chief concern has been the preparation of an exhaustive index. This covers two hundred pages, and gives notes upon the towns, congregations, and ministers mentioned in the register; in all some two thousand titles.

The survey was compiled in the year of “freedom” following the Toleration Act. It was drawn up county by county at the instance of a London committee of the two denominations, organized to give financial aid to the poorer preachers in the provinces. For each county the review distinguishes between “ministers that have a competent supply” and “ministers that may want a supply”; to which is added, to make the survey complete for each county, an enumeration of “places that had or where there may be an opportunity of religious assemblies”. The joint committee broke up soon after the “happy union” had been formed, and the combined register of the two denominations, as far as its original purpose was concerned, was of use no longer. Fortunately it was not destroyed nor lost, but stored in the archives of the Presbyterian board, where it remained for over two centuries until found accidentally a short while ago. Its publication makes a welcome addition to such material as the Evans, the Neal, the 1717, the Thompson, and other manuscript lists or directories of Dissent of a later date.

Those interested for biographical or genealogical reasons in the Nonconforming ministers of the seventeenth century—there are scattered New England connections referred to in the notes—will find that this register may conceivably be of service in testing isolated facts pertaining to the years included in the survey. The index makes the volume in this respect most convenient for reference, for it is really a series of condensed biographies. Also, as one of the few sources available for studying the distribution of Dissent from time to time, this review has especial value from its having been made almost on the morrow of the Toleration Act.

The editorial work is disappointing in one or two slight particulars, more noticeably so in the attempt to offer figures for the numerical strength of Dissent at about the time the survey was taken. The editor, using an Episcopal Return for 1688, sets down the number of Nonconformists at 108,678 “souls” (p. 188). That figure, it happens, is not for “souls” at all, but represents the total of freehold estates held by Nonconformists in the ecclesiastical provinces of Canterbury and York. There is no determinable ratio between freeholds and souls; though there

is reason for placing the number of Nonconformists in 1688 at something under three times the number of freeholds. But statistical conjectures aside, the inherent interest of the register itself, and the comprehensive index, will give the volume a permanent place in the material for the history of Dissent.

C. E. FRYER.

The Expansion of Europe: the Culmination of Modern History.

By RAMSAY MUIR, Professor of Modern History in the University of Manchester. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1917. Pp. xii, 243. \$2.00.)

HAD Professor Muir written his book before the war, he might have been more appreciative of the fact that nations other than Great Britain have had a highly important share in the spread of European civilization over the world. Had he written it after the United States became associated with Great Britain in the struggle, he might not have cavilled at this country so much.

The general purpose of the work is to "survey . . . the sources and character of the great process by which, during the last four centuries, the whole world has been subjugated by the civilisation of Europe, and its bearing upon the problems of the Great War". In the presentation the "predominant place is given to the British Empire", not only because of its territorial extent, but because "the variety of types which it includes makes it the most interesting political structure which ever existed in the world, while the principles upon which it has gradually come to be directed are of the highest significance and value, and have not been sufficiently analysed".

While it is perfectly obvious that in any account of the expansion of Europe the British Empire must be accorded the largest share for both size and achievement, the tale could have been unfolded with much less national self-glorification and with fewer bland assertions of superiority over the rest of mankind. Some allusion might have been made to the fact that, more than was the case with any other great colonial dominion, the British Empire was built up by conquest on the ruins of what had been acquired earlier by Continental European states. Perhaps it might have been desirable not to intimate quite so strongly that "force and fraud" were characteristic of the modes of securing colonial territory by all European countries except Great Britain. It may be doubted, furthermore, whether the principles to which Professor Muir alludes have not been "sufficiently analysed"—by Seeley and Dilke, for example.

The work is divided into ten chapters, of which the first is given over to an explanation of the "meaning and motives of imperialism", and the last to conjectures about the present war and its outcome. About one-fourth of the contents is devoted to the period up to 1763. Of the remainder the chapter on the transformation of the British Empire between 1815 and 1878 is easily the best in the book. Here the reasons for

the tolerant attitude that Great Britain adopted toward its colonies, and notably toward those of the self-governing type, are summarized with much skill and cogency.

In a work on so comprehensive a theme one would naturally expect to find something more than an explanation of the process of territorial and political expansion of Great Britain and incidentally of other European states. A proportionate account should have been furnished of the social, economic, moral, and intellectual results of the contact of Europeans with non-European lands and peoples, including the influence exercised by way of reaction upon the European type of civilization itself. Of all this there is hardly a trace. In fact, the reviewer is inclined to doubt whether Professor Muir has ever made a careful study in all its phases of the actual work of expansion carried on by the several European nations, which would enable him to estimate accurately the accomplishments of each as compared with those of Great Britain alone. Had he done so, he would have fallen into fewer errors alike of concept and of statement, such as that the defeat of the Armada "threw the ocean roads of trade open . . . to the sailors of all nations" and "established the Freedom of the Seas" (page 22).

WILLIAM R. SHEPHERD.

La Question d'Orient depuis ses Origines jusqu'à la Grande Guerre.

By ÉDOUARD DRIAULT. Septième Édition. (Paris: Félix Alcan. 1917. Pp. xv, 432. 7 fr.)

The Eastern Question: an Historical Study in European Diplomacy.

By J. A. R. MARRIOTT. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1917. Pp. viii, 456. \$5.50.)

M. DRIAULT's book, now appearing in its seventh edition, has for nearly twenty years served as the standard summary in the French language of the history of the question of the Near East. Mr. Marriott presents a new study, intended to provide the English-speaking world with a similar summary. The two works are, however, by no means parallel, because of M. Driault's broader conception: he has taken for his theme the "retreat of Islam" in Europe, Africa, and Asia, meaning the shrinking of the total area ruled by Mohammedan governments; Mr. Marriott limits himself strictly to "the gradual disappearance of the Turkish Empire in Europe" and its causes and consequences. Each gives about three-fourths of his space to the events of the last hundred years. Both writers strive to be impartial, but Mr. Marriott, despite the fact that he produced his entire book during the Great War, succeeds somewhat the better in avoiding particularistic points of view. On the other hand, he confines himself more to the recital of events, without arriving at so many clear generalizations and illuminating interpretations as M. Driault. This is, perhaps, only saying that one writer is French and the other English.

It is not necessary to discuss in detail the nine-tenths of M. Driault's book which is verbally identical with former editions. It contains the same errors of fact and questionable points of view, and the same condensation of style and rapidity of transition which have been noted by previous reviewers (as, for example, Stanley Lane-Poole in the *English Historical Review*, XIV. 805-806). M. Monod's preface stands as written in 1898, with some statements which read prophetically, and only a few which have not been realized; it is still impossible to predict the solution of the Question, which is more than ever left "au dieu des batailles". M. Driault has written a new "Avertissement" (pp. iv), in which he says conservatively of the Eastern Question: "Elle est en vérité aussi vieille que le monde, et elle durera autant que lui, car on se disputera toujours la possession de ces pays qui sont historiquement les plus prestigieux de la terre". He has failed to learn from recent investigations that the Ottoman Turks did not come in any considerable numbers from Eastern Asia, that they did not close the roads between Europe and Asia and so cause the great discoveries, and that they did not ruin Damascus and Bagdad, which they found already ruined. He expresses his faith that the present struggle will complete the process of the destruction of the Ottoman power, and that the Orient will then enter upon a more brilliant period than any in its previous history.

His historical additions are noteworthy for the restraint with which he holds the narrative of recent events to the proportion of the whole book. He describes the Turkish revolution of 1908 and the Balkan wars (pp. 281-295), the Russo-Japanese War (which is really outside his subject), and the Anglo-Russian *entente* (pp. 325-329), and the Great War as seen from the Orient (pp. 378-398). Finally he brings down to date his views as regards making an end of Turkey (pp. 410-418). In 1898 he thought that the future of Asia and of the Levant rested with the Franco-Russian alliance. He tolerated perforce the English in the Mediterranean, and ignored the Austrians. He was convinced that the extinction of Turkey was certain and near. Now he must reckon with the thrust into the Orient of Germany, whom he portrays as an "eleventh hour" heir, coming in to despoil those of long standing and prescriptive rights. He feels that the Teutons have no place in the Mediterranean, and predicts their complete expulsion, and the division between France, Russia, England, and Italy, of the lands remaining to the Turk. A strictly impartial view, if such be now possible, would see that Germany is no farther away than England from the Mediterranean, and that Austria has no less direct a relation to its waters than Russia. It is interesting to observe M. Driault's opinion that France has held a preponderance everywhere in the conduct of the Great War (p. 394). Willing to leave to England the control of Egypt, he desires the genuine internationalization of the Suez Canal (pp. xii, 374). This is his only glance toward a solution of the Eastern Question by the superior authority of a world government, which as a plan for the establishment

of permanent peace in that region is immeasurably superior to his scheme of wholly independent Balkan states whose boundaries and whose hegemony are endlessly disputable, and a Western Asia partitioned between rival European powers acting on the principle of national self-interest from far-away capitals.

M. Driault's book is totally lacking in maps, notes, genealogical tables, and indexes. A few references to French writings are the only bibliographical indications, since the imperfect lists of the first edition have been omitted. Aside from these, the only apparatus is an unusually full and well-organized table of contents.

Mr. Marriott is apparently more scientific, since he introduces all the above-mentioned features which M. Driault has omitted. (His bibliographical material is given at the foot of the chapters, a proposed general list having been stricken out.) The book is, however, not superior to that of M. Driault in its use of primary material. Nearly all the facts, and even many of the citations and the maps, have been obtained by careful selection from good secondary works. In his introduction he separates the Question as he contemplates it into six threads: the part played by the Ottoman Turks, the position of the Balkan states and adjacent territories, the problem of the Black Sea and the Straits, the position of Russia in Europe, that of the Hapsburg Empire, and the "attitude of the European Powers in general, and of England in particular, towards any and all of the questions enumerated above". All these ideas he follows through consistently, though the first and the last are less fully developed than the others.

He agrees with M. Driault that "the lands which fringe the Eastern Mediterranean . . . have possessed a significance in world-history incomparably greater than any other". He also develops emphatically the obsolete view that the Ottoman Turks "blocked" the roads across the Old World, and forced the circumnavigation of Africa (p. 20). Furthermore, he seems to believe still that the fall of Constantinople caused the Italian Renaissance (p. 64). The narrative is on the whole well planned and carefully proportioned. There is some repetition, however, and in places too many details are introduced.

Errors are not unusually numerous for a work of such complexity. A few may be corrected: it is inexact to say that the Rumanians "have never actually submitted to a conqueror" (p. 44); Bulgarians probably have only a small proportion of Tartar blood (p. 46); the Crimea was taken by subduing the Tartars and not the Genoese (p. 75); one would like to see the proof that Suleiman the Magnificent became master of "much of the coast of Persia and even North Western India" (p. 82); Selim II. was not the eldest of Roxelana's sons (p. 88); the Bug and the Dniester were not "Russian rivers" in 1711 (p. 123); the statement that "Selim III. was as feeble and reactionary as Abdul Hamid had been vigorous and enlightened" (p. 144) should be reversed; Ibrahim, son of Mehemet Ali, and not Mahmoud II., crushed the Wahabis (p. 192,

corrected on p. 206 without noticing the error); the *Tanzimat* gave more than merely military reform (p. 275); Crete was not the last acquisition of the Ottoman Empire in Europe (p. 331). Smaller errors are the use of "Bajazet I." and "Bayazid II.", "Thorgond" for Torgoud, "Oglon" for Oghlou, "Bushan Eddin" for Burhan ed-Din. In general the transliteration of Oriental names is unsystematic.

The few blemishes detract little from the great positive value of the book, which like much of the work of Englishmen succeeds remarkably well in preserving the true historical spirit in a time of warlike passions. Mr. Marriott does not believe that England "put her money on the wrong horse" in 1854, nor that her part in the Treaty of Berlin was wholly a mistaken rôle. He is able to understand if not to sympathize with the Austrian desire to hold Trieste and reach Salonika. He appears to see no fault in the Italian seizure of Tripoli. He realizes, however, not only the Greek and Serbian claims on Macedonia but also those of Bulgaria and perceives (p. 399) how Bulgaria lost the game in 1912 by the necessity of throwing her forces toward Constantinople, while Greece and Serbia were taking possession of Macedonia. As regards the Great War, he sees as its "dominating motive . . . the realization of the dream of a great Central European Empire stretching from the German Ocean to the Bosphorus" and beyond.

Looking to the future, Mr. Marriott considers it essential to enduring peace that the Eastern Question be solved satisfactorily. The Balkan peoples must be freed from German influence, and then must live side by side "on terms, if not of precise mathematical equality, at least of mutual forbearance and goodwill". As to how the second proposal may be effected, he goes a step beyond M. Driault, to federation after the Swiss model, with "constitutional readjustment, neutralization under an international guarantee, and a confederate citizen army". An international guarantee of neutralization is not enough; the cantons of Switzerland had not before federation cut each other's hearts out as have the Balkan peoples; for a long time to come there is need among the latter, after the establishment of just boundaries, of a compulsory peace maintained by a world authority. If the setting up of such a power seems remote, it is nevertheless far more conceivable than a self-sufficient Balkan federation.

A. H. LYBYER.

Science and Learning in France, with a Survey of Opportunities for American Students in French Universities. An Appreciation by American Scholars. (The Society for American Fellowships in French Universities. 1917. Pp. xxxviii, 454. \$1.50.)

THERE is no greater tribute to heroic France than this splendid volume prepared by some ninety-seven devoted admirers, and sponsored by nine hundred and eighty-six sympathetic American scholars and scien-

tists who were aroused to offer this unique token of their regard by contemplation of the moral and spiritual heights to which France has risen in the present war. This book is at the same time a tribute and a compendium of information. For each field of knowledge there is a chapter regarding French scholarship for the past century, the achievements of its leaders, and the lines of progress they have followed. The scholars of to-day, their contributions, and the courses which they offer in the several French universities are briefly but judiciously described. Special schools, laboratories, libraries, and archives, in fact nearly all the French facilities for research are explained. An introduction by President Emeritus Charles W. Eliot discusses those qualities of the French mind which have interested and attracted foreign scholars since the Middle Ages. Some eighty pages of appendixes explain to the prospective student the organization of the French universities, the preparation required, the mystery of the various degrees, the fees, and all customs as to residence and attendance. All this is done with sympathy as well as full understanding. In the words of the excellent editor, Dean John H. Wigmore, "the authors believe that they are not only pointing the youth of our country to splendid sources of knowledge and wisdom, but are also serving to strengthen and confirm that comradeship of scholars which symbolizes the enduring friendship of the two nations".

No thinking person, however prejudiced, could read this record of scholarly and scientific accomplishment without realizing the sober intellectual power, the strong moral fibre of the French people, and no one who had grasped that fact before the war could have talked glibly, as many did, of France regenerated by the ordeal of battle. Nor can the French people be separated spiritually from their leaders in science and scholarship, as if the latter were a class apart. It is not without significance that Pasteur was declared by popular vote to be the greatest of Frenchmen, and that the statues of Leverrier, of Arago, and of other scientists were erected by national subscription. The soul of her intellectuals is the soul of France. During my sojourn in the French provinces during the year before the war, I wrote repeatedly to friends that the French were the most earnest, serious people I had ever lived among. Whence had sprung the idea of a frivolous people, given to levity, idle wit, and persiflage? Partly it was due, perhaps, to the character of mere passing epochs in French history, partly to travellers' impressions of Parisian boulevards, and, in part, to impressions drawn from badly selected literature which pictured the worst and not the best or even the characteristic in French life. But whatever the prejudice in the past, the world sees now, when France stands at the highest level of her moral attainment, how baseless was the charge of decadence. In the eloquent words of George Ellery Hale in this book, "The ignorant depreciation based on an imperfect knowledge of the French people and an inability to perceive their deeper qualities . . . all this, occasionally

heard in the past, has been forever silenced by the War, revealing a devotion to the state, a quiet but unyielding persistence in the defence of national ideals, which no opponent can overcome”.

Nor is France an intellectual desert with one great academic oasis in Paris. There is a natural assumption by the uninitiated that the best of the French scholars and scientists are gathered in Paris, but one is deeply impressed, as one passes through a series of French provincial universities, with the number of men, having achieved international repute, who are found within their less renowned walls. On my return from giving the Harvard Foundation lectures in the French provincial universities, in 1914, I asked Professor Legouis in Paris why certain very famous men whom I had found in the provinces had not been called to the Sorbonne. He replied, “Great as the Sorbonne is, it cannot embrace all the talent of France”. There was no boast in this but the simple truth. And it is for this reason that the student coming to France for the first time and going very properly to the provincial university to become familiar with the language and the people need have no fear that he will not meet professors worthy of his talents. Nor does the ambitious student need to fear lest France, impoverished by the war, will be unable to provide her scholars and scientists with the most modern implements of their learned vocations. Not from the equipment but from the spirit and genius of the men will come the inspiration which is to reward the young seekers after knowledge. In the year before the war the crushing financial burden of preparation against the menace of militaristic Germany seemed to force the government to starve the laboratories and libraries of the provincial universities. As compared with American laboratories, richly dight, those of the provincial universities looked poor and bare indeed, but in these stinted workshops scientific men were doing and scientific men had done things whose fame went round the world. There, in truth, the mind was not to be changed by place or time, but, through the sheer genius of the French investigator, rich discoveries issued from the shabby workroom. There is no shore of the French intellectual sea which has not been touched by the argonauts of this splendid volume, but in a review meant for the historical gild the explorations in the regions of history and political science require special attention. Here the authors found much that was worthy of their consideration. Merely to catalogue the institutions, such as the Sorbonne, the École des Chartes, the École Libre des Sciences Politiques, the École Pratique des Hautes Études, and the libraries like the Bibliothèque Nationale, the archives such as the Archives des Affaires Étrangères and museums like the Musée de Cluny and the Musée Carnavalet—merely to catalogue these is to impress the reader with the French facilities for historical study and research. But greater far is the revelation of opportunity that comes at the mention of such French historical scholars as Lavissee, Aulard, Seignobos, Bémont, Diehl, Lot, Hauser, and Mathiez, and polit-

ical scientists of such note as Renault, Luchaire, Gide, Lapradelle, Jèze, and Berthélemy—a list, indeed, made up of only those names best known to the reviewer. These men and their great predecessors are among the foremost investigators and writers of history and political science in the world, and they have not been content with mere accumulations of historical detail, but with no sacrifice of thorough research, they have developed qualities of order, clearness, and literary finish which are unrivalled in the historical field.

The authors of the history section have closed their survey with such sound advice, that it is worthy of quotation here. It applies in my opinion to all foreign study in history.

On the whole it is the advanced student of history and not the beginner, who will derive most advantage from a sojourn in France, and especially Paris. The immature youth, who has not secured a good grasp of the essential facts of history, who has not received some substantial training in investigation, and has not some clear ideas concerning the nature of historical study and the reasons why he is pursuing it—a man of this sort is ill prepared to work wisely amid the multiplicity of special courses and the manifold distractions of the French capital. . . . His place is being taken by a growing number of mature students—professors on leave, travelling fellows, newly-made doctors, and others—who desire to continue work already begun here. During their residence abroad these men will no doubt increase their stock of historical information and learn valuable lessons in historical method. But their greatest profit will come from access to great collections of historical material, from the stimulus of contact with new teachers and new ideas, and from first-hand knowledge of the monuments of the European past, and the life of the European present. To such students France offers a warm welcome and a wide opportunity.

C. H. VAN TYNE.

Das Annexionistische Deutschland: eine Sammlung von Dokumenten, die seit dem 4. August 1914, in Deutschland öffentlich oder geheim verbreitet wurden. By S. GRUMBACH. (Lausanne: Payot und Compagnie. 1917. Pp. x, 471. 7 fr. 50.)¹

L'Allemagne Annexioniste: Recueil de Documents publiés ou répandus secrètement en Allemagne depuis le 4 Août 1914. Avec un Appendice, Manifestations anti-Annexionistes. (Paris: Payot et Cie. 1917. Pp. xv, 408. 7 fr. 50.)

THIS is the most interesting collection of documents yet published about the war. A compilation of German statements in favor of annexation (August, 1914, to early 1916), it may fairly be called a sequel to Andler's four volumes of Pan-German utterances and to Nippold's *Der Deutsche Chauvinismus*. More than either of these it serves to set forth the intentions of the Germans. It includes a far wider range of peoples

¹ An English edition of this book, in abbreviated form, has been prepared by J. Ellis Barker, under the title, *Germany's Annexationist Aims* (Dutton).

and organizations. Some of the men Andler quotes are hardly to be found in the *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*. Nor is one much surer about what the Germans as a nation wanted when one reads Nippold, whose *personae*—all of them 1912–1913—are retired admirals and generals engaged in a political campaign, Pan-German organizers, and a few violent newspapers. Grumbach is more convincing not only because he has used testimony of so many kinds, of such representative people and organizations, but because he took the Germans when they were talking most freely. As the German armies drew near to Paris, as the list of Russian prisoners mounted up, the exultant watchers at home opened their hearts: *in vino veritas*.

Here are kings and statesmen, party leaders, publicists, and professors—so many of the latter—editors and magazine writers, business men and agriculturists, stating in the flush of victory what Germany should gain from the war.

Grumbach has done his work carefully. He has had access to German periodicals, he has read the brochures and books. Nor has he taken all that came to his hand. The quotations are ample; they are never torn from the context; the notes are brief but excellent; the citations painstakingly accurate save for a few slight misspellings. If the collection has been made with a purpose, that purpose has in no wise vitiated its scientific value. Grumbach tells us in his introduction that the annexation idea was widely held in all parts of the nation by many kinds of people, and his text proves it. If by the German people is meant those who write, speak, and pass resolutions, it can no longer be doubted that the German people wanted profit (*Frucht*) from the war. Most of them phrase it carefully. "Now that the war has been forced upon us", we must have "security", "guarantees", "rectification of frontiers"; "the soil fertilized by our heroes must remain ours". A minority are less guarded. We want more room, a rearrangement, world power.

Space permits briefest comment on these materials. Above all else the writers quoted desired economic resources for the Fatherland. Belgium's industrial wealth, France's coal, Russia's manufacturing region, Morocco's and the Congo's undeveloped resources, these are gains again and again desired. One is inclined to agree with Bley that the Germans are no longer a nation of dreamers and poets. No, these are men with business imagination.

They are hardly less eager for territories. They would take Belgium that she may never again sin against neutrality; many would despoil France; a few cast envious glances towards Holland, which, to save her colonies in this world of unscrupulous foes, should attach herself to Germany. In respect to Russia there are those who would take only a little—Russia may be of use as a friend—those who would set up a buffer Poland, and those who would drive Russia back towards Asia.

"Mitteleuropa" is sometimes forgotten. Partsch's and Naumann's splendid scheme is not what most of these annexationists have at heart. There are those, indeed, who talk of it as Naumann, and who see in it a promise of unity for Europe and of peace from wars. But most care less about Middle Europe than about Greater Germany.

Opposed to these Continental expansionists are those who fear lest Germany take more than she can assimilate, quietly admitting now and then that Germany has not always governed her conquered well. Now is the time to pick up colonies. Of this theory Delbrück is of course the most notable, although not the most extreme exponent. Colonies, they say, are to be had in Africa, not only Morocco and the Congo, but Rhodesia, and possibly a great Central African Empire. Or Portuguese colonies may be worth taking. A few look towards China: "China has coal". The Bagdad scheme is seldom forgotten. Asia Minor and Mesopotamia are reckoned as already gained. The hopeful think that Persia may be absorbed. One writer links Berlin and Bombay.

Englishmen may well read these documents. If there are those here who do not urge the utter overthrow of the British Empire they are few. Britain's control of the sea, her hold upon Suez and Gibraltar must be taken from her, and if possible Egypt and India, if not in this war, in another. There were men in Germany before the war who urged friendship with Britain. They are not here. The evolution of German hatred of England is an extraordinary phenomenon, but German nationalistic historians are among those to blame. The course of British foreign policy could not have accumulated such a heritage of hate, had not the Germans taken history too hard. They have read into isolated pieces of opportunist diplomacy and separate moves of colonial expansion, made almost absent-mindedly, a great increasing purpose, more far-reaching even than the dreams of the Pan-Germans.

These men have the *weltgeschichtliche* outlook. They are nothing if not *weitausschauende*. They would revenge wrongs done in Louis XIV.'s time; they would learn from the steps by which the Romans built an empire; they would study the imperialism of Charles V.; in the projected overthrow of France they see a nation reduced to the humble rôle of present Spain, and there are no tears for human affairs. All nations push towards the sea—Mahan again. "German history has been one long thrust towards the sea"!

Would one might comment upon the eighty-four pages of anti-annexation utterances at the close. They are largely from Social-Democratic leaders and newspapers. But a few others, among them good names, oppose the *Eroberungspolitik* which they see dominant. Annexations, they declare, will mean the incorporation of unfriendly and irreconcilable peoples, the continuance of the present combination against Germany, and new wars.

WALLACE NOTESTEIN.

La Guerre de 1914: Recueil de Documents intéressant le Droit International. Avec un Avant-Propos de M. PAUL FAUCHILLE, Membre de l'Institut de Droit International. In two volumes. (Paris: A. Pedone. 1917. Pp. vii, 414; 412. 10 fr.)

THE documents appearing in the *Revue Générale du Droit International Public* relative to the present war have been gathered together to form these two valuable volumes. They have been carefully selected from the various official publications and semi-official organs. The text will be found to contain much material that is difficult of access, supplemented by important notes. Although the most important of the diplomatic notes exchanged at the time of the outbreak of the war have been included it was evidently not possible to reproduce all the correspondence given in the red-covered *Diplomatic Documents* published in 1915. The latter publication with its good type will continue to be the most convenient and exhaustive work for those who understand English into which all the documents are translated. Similarly the diplomatic correspondence of the American government relative to its neutral rights is represented by a few only of the most important numbers. The student who is examining the submarine, armed merchantman, or other controversy in which this government participated will find indispensable the volumes of Diplomatic Correspondence issued as special supplements to volumes IX. and X. of the *American Journal of International Law*. The few documents selected for the *Recueil* have been carefully translated into French by those learned in both the law and the languages concerned.

Taking by way of example the famous Lusitania note of May 13, 1915, we must admit that the excellence of the version is somewhat marred by the failure to find idiomatic equivalents for phrases which have passed into history. When we read that the United States government has observed the acts of Germany "with growing concern, distress, and amazement", the climax which this expresses is not given by "un souci, une inquiétude, et un regret croissants". The "strict accountability" of the American note has a menacing sound not echoed by "strictement responsable". The fine sarcasm of the phrase "even that poor measure of safety", which refers to the putting of passengers and crew adrift in small open boats, is lost in the French "des mesures élémentaires de sécurité".

The very complete collection of declarations of war and notifications of the state of war is indicated by a special table at the beginning of each volume. The index—something of a novelty in a French book—though brief is prepared with care and will prove serviceable, as will also the table of documents arranged alphabetically by countries and chronologically by the date of each document. The material relating to Africa and the neutrality of the Congo Basin is very full.

A particularly interesting incident, that of the seizure of the *Presidente Mitre*, may be found under "Argentina". The vessel was under the Argentine flag but was owned by a German company. Because the *Presidente Mitre* was engaged entirely in the coasting trade of Argentina the republic argued that the seizure would constitute an interference with its internal affairs. The vessel was released as a matter of courtesy with the understanding that this action should not serve as a precedent to determine the rights of the question at issue. The case is one of the most interesting that has ever occurred and the international jurist cannot help hoping that the parties may later have occasion to argue out the legal principles involved.

M. Fauchille's collection is not free from the sad chronicle of violations of the laws of war. The dropping of bombs on hospitals, the shooting of the wounded, the sinking of hospital ships, and the deportation of noncombatants, men and women, are made the subject of official protest. In the midst of all these horrors we find the constructive agreement of the eight Allies at the Paris Conference of March 28, 1916, supplemented by other articles adopted by the same powers at the Economic Conference held June 17, 1916. In all the excitement of a great war we are apt to forget the significance of these agreements which aim to make a strong commercial political union against Germany even after the cessation of hostilities. Does it mean that out of the common fear and distress the allied nations have taken the next great forward step on the path of state building?

ELLERY C. STOWELL.

My Four Years in Germany. By JAMES W. GERARD, Late Ambassador to the German Imperial Court. (New York: George H. Doran Company. 1917. Pp. 448. \$2.00.)

THIS book, advertised on the cover as "the most important contribution to the literature of great present-day events", is certainly a fitting sequel to *Germany before the War* by Baron Beyens, and if the latter work is more profound, the Belgian minister had enjoyed a long experience of European politics which the American ambassador lacked. As it is, Mr. Gerard had drawn freely on the contents of the black bag which he guarded so carefully on his journey from Berlin; he ventures no new interpretations, but he adduces many new facts and confirms many suspicions.

Undoubtedly the most important feature is the account of an interview with Bethmann-Hollweg in January, 1917, anent the terms of peace about which Germany had prated so much. Here at last is a definite and authentic statement of German "war aims": evacuation of Belgium—"with guarantees", "rectifications of frontier" east and west, a Teutonic solution of the Balkan problem, the return of colonies and ships, indemnities from all countries (pp. 365-366).

The opening chapters are disappointing, filled as they are with what Mr. Gerard himself calls "details of court life . . . very frivolous and far away" (p. 31) or with superficial analyses of the German constitution and German political parties. But one must remember that the author has written for a large audience—the book has run serially in at least three metropolitan newspapers—with the object of bringing home to the American people the "real Germany" (p. xii) and the temper of our enemy. From this point of view, Mr. Gerard's light treatment is quite justified, as are also the journalistic, popular style, the frequent use of the personal pronoun, and perhaps even the reproductions of court invitations. For such a presentation will appeal to millions who would ignore a more formidable treatise. The reviewer is inclined to believe that for the masses of our people the book will be distinctly informing. The account of the Zabern affair is one of the best hitherto printed in English, while the chapter on "The System" explains in admirable fashion the under-surface methods by which autocracy retains its grip on the German people.

Mr. Gerard makes several contributions to the chain of evidence that Germany had prepared for war in 1914. Zabern, he says, "greatly incensed the Emperor, and I believe, did much to win his consent to the war" (p. 91), driven on as he was by the Crown Prince, who had remarked that "when he came to the throne, there would be war, if not before, just for the fun of it" (p. 96). And Mr. Gerard believes that "a certain line of action had been agreed upon" before the Emperor went to Norway (p. 129). Corroborating this is the remark let fall by Prince Henry at a dinner given to the British fleet visiting Kiel in June: "We are sorry you are going, and we are sorry you came" (p. 107). The Emperor himself said on August 10: "The English change the whole situation—an obstinate nation—they will keep up the war. It cannot end soon" (p. 206). Jagow rejected Secretary Bryan's peace treaty for the same reason that he advanced to Sir Edward Goschen against respecting the neutrality of Belgium: "Germany would be deprived of her greatest asset in war, namely her readiness for a sudden and overpowering attack" (p. 61). A letter sent by Mr. Gerard to the chancellor on July 31, offering the mediation of America in the interests of peace, "never produced any reply" (p. 132). Prince Lichnowsky is twice quoted (pp. 100, 102) as reporting to Berlin that Great Britain did not desire war.

In the matter of German-American relations, Mr. Gerard seems to believe that in the spring of 1914 Germany proposed to Great Britain an intervention in Mexico (p. 59), and he adverts several times to the rôle which Germany expected Japan to play. In all his negotiations over problems raised by the war, the ambassador was handicapped by the unassailable conviction of the German authorities that America would not fight, an attitude for which Mr. Gerard holds the Americans in Germany and the vociferous German-Americans in this country pri-

marily responsible. The presidential campaign was also interpreted to mean that the United States was bent on peace at any price. Very interesting is the revelation that during the long submarine negotiations Germany several times proposed the marking of American vessels and that President Wilson always refused such overtures (pp. 234, 239): which raises serious doubt whether the German government was sincere in its final proposal to that effect on January 31, 1917. Indeed Mr. Gerard leaves no doubt of German bad faith in general: an American passport taken up for *visé* was not returned and was used by a spy shot in London (p. 152); the ambassador was ultimately prevented from visiting British prisoners in spite of the Anglo-German agreement (pp. 195-196); Zimmermann denied on January 6, 1917, that unrestricted submarine warfare would be resumed (p. 364); Bethmann-Hollweg declared that the resumption was occasioned by President Wilson's address to the Senate on January 22, 1917, whereas the Zimmermann note to Mexico had been despatched three days before (p. 370); and all the while that Germany was asserting in America her desire to avoid hostilities, at home a violent propaganda was being conducted against the United States by the Foreign Office through the "League of Truth", which indulged in base slander and open lies (p. 309 ff). Mr. Gerard has set his story in an admirable perspective, for which both the patriot and the historian will be grateful. It was likewise well to record the remark of the Emperor on May 1, 1916, that "there was no longer any international law, to [which] statement the chancellor agreed" (p. 340).

Mr. Gerard holds out little hope of a revolution in Germany. The agrarians are really anxious to continue the war because they can secure the labor of prisoners at nominal wages and are making enormous profits (pp. 191-192). The liberal element, no inconsiderable body (ch. XVIII.), is helpless before the military, as indeed are the civil authorities from the chancellor down. The deportations from Lille, Turcoing, and Roubaix were ordered without the knowledge of Bethmann-Hollweg, who promised Mr. Gerard to speak to the emperor about them (p. 334). Bethmann was also anxious to avoid a rupture with the United States, and Zimmermann for all his swagger—in January, 1916, he declared that Germany was ready for war with the United States (p. 244) and a year later that America would not fight (p. 376)—was distinctly unhappy when Mr. Gerard demanded his passports (p. 377). Yet such was their "sheer weakness" (p. 357) that they could not secure Mr. Gerard an interview with Hindenburg and Ludendorff (p. 359). There is a tragic picture of the emperor, almost as helpless as his chancellor, and apparently opposed to excesses; at least "he said that he would not have permitted the sinking of the *Lusitania* if he had known" (p. 252), and he is believed to have warned the submarine commanders, in February, 1916, to be "careful" (p. 245). One hopeful note is sounded in the statement that the Belgian deportations were ordered because Ludendorff feared the British would break through and the general staff did not relish retreating through a hostile population (p. 351).

Unfortunately the mechanics of the book are poorly handled. The discussion of German institutions and politics should have been continuous, instead of being separated in chapters II., IV., and X. The account of prisoners of war, excellent in itself, need not have come before the chapter on the political and diplomatic problems of the first days of the war. The division of the topic of German-American relations into the twelfth and seventeenth chapters, in the midst of the *Sussex* negotiations, is decidedly irritating. The same fault is sometimes noticeable in a single chapter, or matter properly belonging in one chapter is introduced in a later one. The proof-reading is careless. "Polo de Bernabe" (pp. 35, 382), "Kaiserhoff" (p. 183), "Pascha" (p. 35), and "Sverbeeu" (p. 35) are not worthy of so accomplished a linguist as Mr. Gerard. "Arch Duke" (p. 106) and "motor men" (p. 409) are properly written as single words. "Grey" is a curious slip for "Goschen" (p. 132). "Slavish" (p. 55) is a dubious substitute for "Slavic".

Certain errors may be noted. There is no imperial minister for education (p. 41); the deputies of Alsace-Lorraine were admitted to the Reichstag in 1874, not in 1871 (p. 79); Sadowa was fought nearly four, not two weeks (p. 101) after the rupture between Austria and Prussia. *Kriegsgefahrzustand*, not *Kriegzustand*, was proclaimed on July 31, 1914 (p. 403). Mr. Gerard overstates the anti-monarchical sentiments of the Socialists (pp. 45, 394), for only a quarter of the Socialist vote came from avowed Socialists, and if the word "republic" has recently been uttered by a Minority Socialist, the Majority have stood manfully by the emperor. "It is hard to conceive that Poland was at one time perhaps the most powerful kingdom in Europe" (p. 49). It is indeed. Surely it is too much to say that "the whole world honours Bethmann-Hollweg for his honesty" (p. 400). Has Mr. Gerard forgotten that speech in which the chancellor admitted that the pledges to the United States were given only because the time was not then propitious for resuming unrestricted submarine warfare?

In spite, however, of these blemishes, every American will read this book with satisfaction. For there will subsist no doubt that Mr. Gerard left no stone unturned to preserve peace or that he did not keep the German government accurately informed of the truth about America. Granted that his methods were sometimes bizarre and his language unconventional, it is clear that they often secured his ends when other means had failed and that, in all probability, no kind of diplomacy could have saved the situation.

BERNADOTTE E. SCHMITT.

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

Correspondence and Documents during Roger Wolcott's Governorship of the Colony of Connecticut, 1750-1754. Edited by ALBERT C. BATES. [Collections of the Connecticut Historical Society, vol. XVI.] (Hartford: The Society. 1916. Pp. xxxv, 557. \$3.00.)

ALTHOUGH the period covered by this volume is marked by few events that are specially noteworthy in the history of Connecticut, the documents here printed are in many ways among the most useful that the Connecticut Historical Society has issued in its valuable series of governors' letters and papers. Many of them concern problems that had long troubled the authorities of the colony, such as the Mohegan controversy, of which everyone concerned must have been heartily sick by this time; the boundary quarrel with Massachusetts, regarding which Wolcott remarked in one of his letters, "There is not the least prospect here that the Massachusetts will ever agree to settle the line, they only want us to fall into a drouse and then take advantage of us"; the question of taxing the Church of England men; and the disposal of the appropriation made by Parliament to recompense Connecticut for the share she had taken in the late war—all of which were unsettled matters holding over from the previous administration. But in addition many new problems of larger import appear, chief among which are the attempt of the West India merchants and agents in England to revive the lost bill of 1731, prohibiting trade with the foreign West Indies; the appointment by Gov. Wentworth of New Hampshire, the surveyor general of the woods, of a deputy surveyor for Connecticut; the act of Parliament forbidding the issue of paper money in New England; the plans of the Susquehanna Company for a settlement in the Wyoming Valley; and the proposed meeting of the commissioners at Albany, which resulted in the Albany Conference of 1754. Most notorious of all is the Spanish ship-case, the details of which cannot be given here, but which involved the colony in an awkward situation and cost Wolcott a re-election as governor, because the people of the colony believed, most unjustly, that he had been bribed and that the case had been so mismanaged as to render them liable for the losses incurred. The activities of the deputy surveyor and the ship-case furnish evidence for the working of the vice-admiralty court in America; the distribution of the parliamentary grant gives us details as to the financial investments of the colony in England; while the failure of Wolcott to be re-elected governor offers Mr. Bates an opportunity to discuss the difficult problem of the franchise in Connecticut, regarding which we need more information. It is well known that but a small proportion of the adult male population voted for governor and deputies and that the political affairs of "democratic" Connecticut were run by a coterie of prominent

families and individuals, but in what proportion is not clear. Dr. McKinley had no sufficient figures to give for this period, but Mr. Bates thinks that in 1754 the 2564 who voted for Phineas Lyman represent approximately the whole number of freemen voting for nominees, which in a white population of 130,000 would be about one in ten of those who could have voted under a system of manhood suffrage. Elsewhere he puts the number of freemen at one in eight. Thus in 1754, according to this reckoning, the adult males would be 22,000, the freemen 2800, and the voters 2564. These figures may be correct, but in 1766, John Tully of Saybrook put the number of actual voters at "between 7 and 8000 freemen", and in 1767 Dr. Stiles, venturing the guess that the total number of freemen was about 12,000, says that of these 8322 voted, a little more than two-thirds, an estimate in close accord with that of Tully. Eight thousand voters in a population of 160,000 would give a proportion of one in four. Either Mr. Bates has underestimated the number of freemen and wrongly assumed that the votes cast represent the entire body of voting freemen, or else the number of freemen had greatly increased in the ensuing twelve and thirteen years, an increase for which, as far as I know, there is no evidence. In any case there can be no doubt that great electoral apathy existed in Connecticut in colonial times.

CHARLES M. ANDREWS.

The American Revolution in Our School Text-Books: an Attempt to Trace the Influence of Early School Education on the Feelings toward England in the United States. By CHARLES ALTSCHUL, with an Introduction by JAMES T. SHOTWELL, Professor of History in Columbia University. (New York: George H. Doran Company. 1917. Pp. xi, 168. \$1.00.)

THE author of this interesting study set out to learn from the examination of a limited field in the text-book histories of the United States whether there were prejudices established in the minds of children of this and of earlier generations of Americans through the kind of data taught them about the American Revolution. He wondered, as many have, why the mass of American people rallied to the moral support of France rather than of England in the Great War. Why has the country whose language we speak, whose customs we have followed, whose ideas of liberty we have inherited, and whose legal procedure has determined ours, made so little appeal to the average American? Why has this brave people, changing the very basis of their civilization from a peaceful to a militaristic one in the midst of the most frightful of wars, saving civilization itself from the brutal assault of the Prussian autocracy, and rising to a pinnacle of true fame and glorious service to mankind—why has this noble people won so little sympathy here in the land dominated by their nearest of kin? The answer in part is found by Mr. Altschul

in the manner of teaching the history of the American Revolution in our schools. Drawing his data from some ninety-three text-books, forty of which were in use twenty years ago, and the remaining fifty-three in use at present, he establishes some significant results. Of these, he finds that fourteen of the older and fifteen of the newer books deal fully with the grievances of the colonists, but make no reference to general political conditions in England prior to the American Revolution, nor to any prominent Englishman—like Pitt, Burke, Fox, and Barré—who defended the American cause. Seven of the old and five of the new mention Pitt only, but do not explain English political conditions. A small minority present those facts about British sympathizers with the American cause and their temporary political helplessness which alone can give an American reader a proper understanding of the Revolution. The distribution of the text-books of these several types in the great cities of America is given so that one may estimate the location and extent of the malign influence of the books which teach the subject in such a way as to prejudice the child's mind against England. A large part of the volume is devoted to giving extracts from the various books of the differing types. The total result is to give definite and concrete proof of an evil educational tendency of which many have been long but only vaguely aware. The book is a compilation with a moral which Professor Shotwell draws in his excellent introduction, wherein he points out that the Great War has shown the importance of the teaching of history in the formation of national ideas. He might have clinched that assertion by showing how the German to-day bases his curious arguments as to his mission in this war on premises taught him during childhood, premises unconsciously assumed by him as axiomatic but regarded by the rest of the world as unthinkable. Mr. Shotwell says fairly that text-books have as a rule been the product of limited knowledge of the actual facts, that they have for the most part persisted in perpetuating ancient, uncriticized traditions which have accumulated since the events themselves. He is perfectly right, but let him assume the rôle of a reformer and learn to his sorrow how the publisher will attack at every point the effort to tell the real and essential things in his country's history, and how having gotten through that stone wall with a small remnant of his convictions he will find that the school teachers and normal professors and all the horde of pedagogical experts will array themselves against the little truth that is left because it is not the conventional thing, the history which has been taught in the past.

C. H. VAN TYNE.

Official Letter Books of W. C. C. Claiborne, 1801-1816. Edited by DUNBAR ROWLAND, B.S., LL.B., LL.D., Director Mississippi Department of Archives and History. In six volumes. (Jackson,

Mississippi: State Department of Archives and History. 1917.
Pp. viii, 394; 394; 399; 423; 468; 400.)

ALL persons who have had occasion to delve into the history of the lower Mississippi Valley will welcome this publication. In this number the reviewer includes that wider circle who have profited from the energy and foresight with which Dr. Rowland has collected and published historical material, as well as that smaller group of investigators who have experienced his courteous welcome within the model department at Jackson. Members of the latter group have long known that the publication of the "Letter Books" of Governor Claiborne was the director's cherished project. They recognize the importance of the collection and of the executive whose name it bears. They know something of his career as the second governor of Mississippi Territory and later as chief executive of Orleans Territory and of the state of Louisiana. They regard the problems of his sixteen years of service as among the most important connected with American expansion, for they included the more thorough establishment of national control in the Old Southwest, the settlement of the controversies arising from the Louisiana Purchase, the occupation of the trans-Mississippi region and its defense during the second war with Great Britain, and the control of a polyglot frontier population and the suppression of filibustering among its more restive elements. All these general movements in their manifold phases receive detailed attention in the correspondence of Claiborne and those who were aware of this fact will hasten to congratulate Dr. Rowland for making these letters accessible to a wider circle of investigators.

No two persons would edit such a monumental work in precisely the same way. The reviewer, therefore, who fully recognizes its general value, may be pardoned if he ventures to point out certain features in which he thinks it might have been greatly improved. This is notably true of the bibliography. In an appendix the editor presents a list of books, newspapers, and manuscripts relating to the period of Claiborne's activity, but one notes some conspicuous omissions. He also gives a list of the West Florida papers taken from the Pickett Collection in the Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress. A list of other important collections as noted below, would have been equally serviceable. He fails to tell us that he had previously published a portion of the present work (I. 1-284) in his *Mississippi Territorial Archives* (I. 342-603); and another portion (III. 35-121 of the present publication) in his *Third Annual Report* (pp. 108-169), as director of the Department of Archives and History. Both of these earlier publications also contain correspondence of Claiborne's fellow executives in Mississippi Territory that will be useful in connection with the present work. The *Third Annual Report* also lists (pp. 180-200, 212-234) the Claiborne material and this must serve as a table of contents for the present work. One notes that the editor has avoided some minor errors in dates and spelling that occurred in these lists and that the most conspicuous gap in them (*Third*

Annual Report, p. 218) is now represented by a fairly continuous series of letters (IV. 123 to V. 81) supplied from material that later came to light. Dr. Rowland does not mention this fortunate find nor does he add to the brief account of the Claiborne Collection given in his *Fourth Annual Report* (p. 29).

The reviewer feels that Dr. Rowland has dismissed too lightly the material of co-ordinate character in the Bureau of Rolls and Library, Department of State. The six volumes of the "Claiborne Correspondence", together with some kindred material in that repository, are mentioned in Van Tyne and Leland's *Guide to the Archives . . . in Washington* and the contents are listed in Parker's *Calendar of Papers . . . relating to the Territories of the United States*. By making use of these aids in connection with the published *Letter Books* the careful student may learn whether he can pursue his further investigations to best advantage in Washington or in Jackson. But this task would have been greatly lightened and in many cases rendered unnecessary had the present work included all the unduplicated Claiborne material in both places. The Washington repository is more likely to contain the originals of the correspondence and these originals are accompanied by enclosures that often were not retained by Claiborne or his representatives. On the other hand the manuscript "Letter Books" contain some local material that does not appear in Washington. It seems a pity that two complementary collections of such intrinsic value were not combined in the present work. Possibly consideration of expense or some local restriction prevented this; but at least the table of contents of the two collections should have been listed, preferably in parallel columns, and in the body of the work, either in the foot-notes or in the heading of each document, all duplicates should have been noted (possibly by the numbers in Parker's *Calendar*). No statement, in preface or foot-note, shows that the copy prepared from the "Letter Books" was collated with duplicate letters elsewhere. The meticulous student must content himself with the assumption that he has before him the carefully edited text of merely one source. Of this source and of its real value we believe he may feel reasonably certain. By resorting to Parker's *Calendar* he may get trace of other sources that were not utilized to supply *lacunae* in the present text (*e. g.*, III. 238; IV. 211). Some of the larger gaps in the correspondence (*e. g.*, I. 284; VI. 283) are evidently irremediable. The foot-notes are open to criticism—in general, because lacking specific references to authorities, although a few (as in V. 35) are misleading. The editor offers some personal opinions that are open to question. For instance, he comments altogether too favorably on Kemper (V. 133), attributes to Claiborne (IV. 344; V. 115) sentiments that the latter merely borrowed from Jefferson, and credits him with far too much influence (V. 208) in the disposal of the Florida Parishes. General references to the correspondence of Mississippi executives on file at Jackson (V. 81, 330, and elsewhere) should also indicate that some of

this material, as in the case of Claiborne's correspondence, is duplicated in the Bureau of Rolls and Library. The editor refers frequently to his "home sources", the "West Florida Papers", but, as the reviewer knows, the student will have to supplement this and the other collections in Jackson and Washington with those in Seville, before he can make a "thorough study of all sides of the controversy over West Florida and of the revolution growing out of it" (V. 81, note). Thanks to Dr. Rowland he can make an excellent start on such a study at Jackson and save much research in places where conditions are less favorable for productive work.

In foot-notes and in the heading of the separate documents the reviewer notes numerous typographical errors, misspellings, an absence of accents, the use of abbreviations in the headings, and the simple but less dignified "Thomas" Jefferson and "James" Monroe, rather than the proper title. The spelling of proper names in the text, too, brings up a difficult point. Claiborne and his contemporaries, like the majority of American officials, uniformly had a difficult time in spelling and pronouncing foreign proper names. Most of their attempts in this work can be readily interpreted, but "Quagila" (Coahuila, III. 31), "Quakin De Agarts" or "Quaquin de Ugante" (Joaquín de Ugarte, II. 374, 388), "Mondeva" (Monclova, III. 31), "Don Antonio Cowers" (Cordero, IV. 166), "Mr. Irvine" (George W. Erving, IV. 343)—to mention merely a few of their worst offenses—certainly call for the correct form either in brackets or foot-notes. Without this precaution, in far too many other cases one is uncertain whether to hold the original writer or the proof-reader responsible for the present form of words.

The volumes are of convenient size and simply but neatly bound. The type is clear and of good size and the press work well done but the printer's characters are not always intelligible. The index is satisfactory. One regrets the lack of a table of contents, which would also serve to indicate the limits of the several manuscript volumes. The editor has evidently adhered to the original order in which the documents appeared in the "Letter Books", but he would have been justified in adopting a strict chronological order, at least for the principal letters, accompanying each with the proper enclosures. The work merits the careful attention of historical scholars; and despite such criticism, of an attempted supplemental character, as the reviewer has felt called on to express, it should meet a favorable reception as a substantial contribution to the early history of the Old Southwest in the period following the transfer of Louisiana.

ISAAC JOSLIN COX.

The History of Early Relations between the United States and China, 1784-1844. By KENNETH SCOTT LATOURETTE. [Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, vol. XXII., pp. 1-209, August, 1917.] (New Haven: Yale University Press. 1917. Pp. 209. \$2.20.)

As soon as the treaty had been signed by which their independence was admitted, the people of the American Confederation turned their energies to navigation and world commerce. China was then, as she remains to-day, a land of vast opportunity, and to China, with vision and enthusiasm and confidence, New England and New York merchants were soon sending their ships.

In a very substantial though brief narrative, organized in five chapters, Professor Latourette tells the story of the first sixty years of American commercial, cultural, and political relations with China, bringing the story through the signing of the first American-Chinese treaty. The work is the result, shown both in text and in foot-note exhibits and comment, of an exhaustive study and thorough digesting of original materials. Fifty-five pages of critical bibliography speak for the materials and the labor which have gone into the making of the book.

For the student of American history the accounts perhaps most likely to command attention are those which have to do with the activities of various families, firms, and cities in the development of the China trade, and of the part which the China trade played in the opening of the Northwest; for the student of Far Eastern history, these latter reversed, then, the details with regard to the part played by American ships and American firms in the Canton trade, and in general the circumstances of that trade and the relations of the representatives of the leading nations engaging in it. For those who are especially interested in the most substantial investment that Americans have yet made in China, the investment of cultural influence, the chapter on the Beginnings of American Missions to China is rich in data and effective in composition.

The reviewer hopes that Professor Latourette will some day do as well by the period since 1844 as he has done by that preceding.

No American believer in the capacity of the American people for honest and generally advantageous adventure, and in the responsibility for positive activity which that capacity entails can read without stirrings of pride—followed by regret, as he thinks of the later decline—the story of the entry, the enterprise, and the early successes of American shipping on the Pacific. "It can safely be said . . . that the Oregon country was preserved to the United States because of the importance it was felt to have in the Canton commerce" (p. 57). "The famous clippers were born in the trade with China" (p. 70). "Americans . . . among the foreign merchants . . . [at Canton] . . . were second in

influence and importance only to the English. The American factory was one of the best in the thirteen" (p. 81). "The efficiency of the ships lay largely in the ability of the men who manned them. The American crews were smaller than those on English or European vessels. . . . They were for the most part American born. . . . The China trade is an illustration of what American genius, today spending itself in manufactures and internal transportation and development, can accomplish when diverted to the sea" (pp. 46-47).

We are to-day turning this "genius" to problems of marine along with other branches of combined spiritual and mechanical effectiveness. May the history, wherever read, of American ship-building and navigation of a hundred years ago be an inspiration to the men who are building and the men who sail our ships to-day.

STANLEY K. HORNBECK.

History of Transportation in the United States before 1860. Prepared under the direction of BALTHASAR HENRY MEYER by CAROLINE E. MACGILL and a staff of collaborators. [Contributions to American Economic History from the Department of Economics and Sociology of the Carnegie Institution of Washington.] (Washington: The Carnegie Institution of Washington. 1917. Pp. xi, 678. \$6.00.)

ALTHOUGH contained within the covers of a single volume, the *History of Transportation* is neither the work of one writer nor that of a group of co-operating authors. In the preface Dr. Meyer explains that, instead of writing or even editing the volume, he has been forced by circumstances to limit himself to the task—a labor of love—of directing the compilation of the book. Very frankly premising that the work as published has "many defects", Dr. Meyer gives a list of several monographic studies in transportation, prepared with assistance from his division of the Department of Economics and Sociology of the Carnegie Institution, and published in various ways. These studies, with others incomplete or unpublished, and with various indexes and collections of notes, have been placed in the hands of Miss Caroline E. MacGill, and "it has been her function to weave these together and to fill in through her own studies whatever was necessary to give the volume continuity". The result is the *History of Transportation*.

The first chapter, a long one upon early trails, roads, and natural waterways, begins with a demonstration of the influence of the early West upon transportation, and throughout the first four chapters the affairs of the West and the connections with the West predominate. This is a highly important topic, but the consideration of it should not have precluded an examination of the legal and institutional phases of highways in the seaboard states. All these had developed general laws as to the establishment and maintenance of roads, which, with the laws

concerning turnpikes, exerted an important influence on both the older and the newer parts of the country. Miss MacGill indeed cites many denunciations of the roads by travellers, and, in her second chapter, presents a vast amount of information as to the charges for transportation on roads and waterways. One cause of this underestimation of the roads in the older communities arises from Miss MacGill's belief—which to the reviewer seems to be erroneous—that the commerce between the seaboard colonies was of small extent, that transportation by land was quite inconsiderable, and that the cause of this state of things is attributable to the restrictive policy of Great Britain (pp. 4, 65, 77). The third and fourth chapters treat of rivers, trails, and roads in the trans-Appalachian region and of early land routes in Ohio, an arrangement which leads to some repetition.

With the fifth chapter one comes to the central body of the book. This falls naturally into two divisions, the first of which (chapters V.–IX.) has to do with waterways and canals, in New England, the Middle Atlantic states, the South, and the West; and the second (chapters X.–XVI.) with plank-roads (chapter X.), and with railroads, following the same geographical arrangement. Here the process of weaving together the monographs becomes fully manifest. Cleveland and Powell's *Railway Promotion and Capitalization in the United States* furnishes a few pages of general introduction to the history of internal improvements and part of a general chapter on the first railroads; Bishop's *State Works of Pennsylvania* and Phillips's *History of Transportation in the Eastern Cotton Belt* contribute the larger part of the respective chapters on water transportation and on railroads in the territory which each book covers; while Gephart's *Transportation and Industrial Development in the Middle West*, already drawn upon for chapters III. and IV., is again used for canals and railroads beyond the Alleghanies. Three chapters of Brownson's *History of the Illinois Central Railroad to 1870* are also incorporated. A final chapter of summary and review makes further use of Cleveland and Powell's book, with additions from Haney's *Congressional History of Railways in the United States to 1850*.

The transfer to the *History of Transportation* of the material thus borrowed from the monographs is accomplished by a process more than Procrustean. Page after page is taken, with changes and omissions at will. Both the order of topics and even the phrases of sentences are altered, usually for the sake of abbreviation, but sometimes for reasons that are not easily apparent. That the meaning of the author is occasionally distorted will not be a matter of surprise. But of course the book represents far more than such borrowings, for Miss MacGill has made industrious use of the other materials placed in her hands, and, especially dealing with New York and New England, has painstakingly consulted the works of standard authority. For the general history of canals and railroads in the regions of the seaboard and the older North-

west, the result of her labors has been the accumulation of a mass of valuable information.

But at many points the book fails to relate the facts which it presents to the currents of economic and political development in the United States. This is true in general as to the years after 1820, and in particular as to the decade 1850-1860. Strangely enough the West, which in the earlier chapters overshadows the East, in the latter part of the book is inadequately treated. The relation to transportation of the public lands (except in the case of the Illinois Central), the surplus revenue, the panic of 1837, the distribution of 1841, the proposed assumption of state debts, and the question of repudiation; Calhoun's effort to win the West in 1845; transportation as affected by the annexation of Texas and by the acquisition of territory from Mexico; the influence of the Santa Fé and the Oregon trails; the importance of the railroads of the old Northwest in their bearing on the election of 1860—for light on these topics the student must look elsewhere. The movement for a railroad to the Pacific, when the volume draws to a close, is still a "dream": though a chapter is taken from Haney on routes across the isthmus.

The volume is well indexed. There are five excellent maps, for which acknowledgment is made to the Department of Historical Research of the Carnegie Institution. The bibliography covers forty pages, but many titles are missing that one would expect to find. As a single example may be cited the *Catalogue of Books on Railway Economics* published in 1912 by the University of Chicago Press for the Bureau of Railway Economics.

ST. GEORGE L. SIOUSSAT.

The History of Mother Seton's Daughters: the Sisters of Charity of Cincinnati, Ohio, 1809-1917. By Sister MARY AGNES McCANN, M.A. In two volumes. (New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1917. Pp. xxvii, 336; vii, 334. \$5.00.)

WHAT strikes the reader of these volumes is the almost meticulous attention of the writer to historical exactitude. That she approached her task well prepared a mere glance at the comprehensive bibliography given in the first volume assures the reader, while historical sources—private journals, letters of prominent churchmen, community records, long-forgotten newspapers and periodicals—are quoted with a familiarity which comes of deep research. In fact the work is, rather than an historical narrative, a concatenation of reproduced historical sources, many of which are here published for the first time. This type of historical study has long been a desideratum among students of American church history. The subject, though not entirely new to readers familiar with the estimable works of De Barbary, McSweeney, Sadlier, Seton, and White, is here treated with a comprehensiveness and authentication of

facts that makes this the authoritative history of the American Daughters of Charity.

The work may be divided into two parts, which correspond to the two distinct periods of the history: Mother Seton's Daughters of Emmitsburg (1808-1851); and Mother Seton's Daughters of Cincinnati (1851-1870). Each period is the creation of a remarkable woman: Mother Seton and Mother Margret George respectively. Elizabeth Bayley Seton is without doubt the greatest Catholic and one of the few really great women of United States history. At a time when American institutions were in the moulding she labored through poverty and hardships against formidable opposition to impress the name of God deep on the heart of her people. The Revolution was a *fait accompli*; constitutional guarantees of political, economic, and religious freedom had opened our ports to European immigrants; the Catholic population, already considerable, was rapidly increasing; Baltimore was an archbishopric, New York and Boston bishoprics; colleges under Catholic auspices had been opened at Baltimore, Georgetown, and Emmitsburg; missionaries were following the settlers out into the great Middle West and South; Catholicity, which had come to the New World with the *Santa Maria*, was being gradually diffused throughout the length and breadth of the republic. The need of the moment was an organized, well-trained corps of religious female teachers for the conduct of elementary schools, particularly free schools for poor and dependent children. Isolated attempts to establish such schools had only served to emphasize this need. That many noble women there were, capable and ready for this work, those familiar with conditions realized, but the apparently insoluble difficulty was to find a leader competent to organize and direct such an institution. Broad vision, an intrepid spirit, deep Christian charity, and a keen sense of the practical would be required of this American Madame LaGras. An accidental meeting which occurred some time in 1806 between the Reverend Mr. Dubourg, a man of rare prudence and deep knowledge of human nature, and Elizabeth Bayley Seton, a young widow already burdened with the care of five children and a convert of only a few months to the Catholic Church, discovered both the leader and her director. The sequence of this meeting, the establishment of the American Daughters of Charity and of Catholic elementary schools in the United States, is the subject of this interesting history. Of unusual interest is the writer's account of the affiliation of the Emmitsburg mother-house with the French Sisters of Charity and the consequent establishment of the Cincinnati mother-house. Conclusive evidence is introduced to show that this act was not only beyond but positively contrary to the wishes of Mother Seton. Had it not been for the courageous resistance of Mother Margret George and her companions, Father Deluol's act of 1851 would have closed the history of the American Daughters of Charity. Emmitsburg passed into the hands of a foreign community, but on the banks of the Ohio Mother Seton's institute continued its work of benefaction.

The writer must have given much time and labor to the study of her subject, but unfortunately the arrangement and composition of her volumes show signs of haste. The divisions are not distinctly marked; the chronological order of events is frequently confused; and the style is at times wanting in that precision and objectivity which should characterize historical writings. The omission of many of the long newspaper quotations and school programmes which abound throughout the second volume would have contributed to the interest without destroying the completeness of the narrative. And though the reader finds the narration of many events extraneous to this work interesting, he cannot but wish that Sister Agnes had saved them for another volume which we hope some day she will publish, the *History of Catholicity in the Middle West*.

Early Life and Letters of General Thomas J. Jackson, "Stonewall Jackson". By his Nephew, THOMAS JACKSON ARNOLD. (New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1916. Pp. 379. \$2.00.)

THOMAS JACKSON ARNOLD, author or editor of this book on General Jackson, is the nephew of the great Confederate commander. He was a favorite with the family at Lexington and even when Professor Jackson became one of the heroes of the war, personal relations were intimate. The letters that now find a place in our voluminous war literature were written to the author's mother, a devoted sister of Jackson, or to the editor himself. Other letters of value there are but few. These evidences of Jackson's growth and inner life are both enlightening and characteristic, although it must be said that they do not materially qualify the picture we have in Dabney's *Life and Campaigns* or Henderson's remarkable portrait of more recent years.

An opinion of Mexico written from the battle-field in 1847 shows a little of the feeling that persists to-day:

As I believe that this country is destined to be reformed by ours, I think that probably I shall spend many years here and may possibly conclude (though I have not yet) to make my life more natural by sharing it with some amiable Señorita. . . . This country offers more inducements for me than the United States, inasmuch as there is more room for improvement in everything that is good and commendable. The term corruption expresses the state of this unfortunate people better than any other in the English language (p. 129).

It was a gay and "unregenerate" West Pointer that wrote of reforming Mexico and of taking unto himself a wife in a strange land. A more serious tone is struck a few years later in a letter to the same sister:

The passage of Scripture from which I have derived sufficient support, whenever applied, is in the following words, "Acknowledge God in all thy ways, and He shall direct thy paths". What a comfort is

this! My dear sister, it is useless for men to tell me that there is no God, and that His benign influence is not to be experienced in prayer, when it is offered in conformity to the Bible. For some time past not a single day has passed without my feeling His hallowing presence whilst at my morning prayers (p. 195).

So constant and earnest is this religious note in Jackson's letters that the editor seems to fear that the reader may think there was something beyond the normal in the man; and on more than one occasion he elides passages which evidently have to do with extreme views. On page 181 where Jackson is arguing for the inspiration of the Bible and again on page 193 where he is evidently greatly concerned about the salvation of his sister's soul, Mr. Arnold restrains his uncle in this way. It is the right of the editor, but the historian who wants to know all there is to be known wonders how much may be omitted. It certainly would seem from these letters that there has never been any exaggeration on this subject by any of Jackson's biographers.

This intense religious faith overcame Jackson's sense of humor, for we are told that every meal in the home of the professor of natural and experimental philosophy in the Virginia Military Institute must be ready exactly at the appointed time, that the signal for breakfast for the cadets at the institute was likewise the signal for every one in his household to sit down to table, and that there was seldom if ever the slightest departure from this rule. There is no protest by the reviewer here against the rule, but the fact and the extreme punctiliousness of it all for women, children, and guests alike would seem to indicate a defective sense of humor, as indeed it seems to me is noticeable in the fact that Jackson married two wives and took the same honeymoon trip with each!

But a failing sense of humor does not argue against the greatness of the man, although the evidences of greatness in these letters consist in the extreme simplicity and directness of the man, perhaps in the half-conscious conviction that whatever he said and did was right and in his willingness to subject himself and all around him to the most rigid discipline.

On another account these letters offer food for thought. The Virginia Military Institute was established a few years before the outbreak of the Civil War for the purpose of training young Virginians for military careers, for some war. "What war"? one naturally asks. Twenty-five or thirty thousand dollars a year made a good round sum for Virginia at that time. But there was no effective resistance to these appropriations and the second best military school in the country was maintained at Lexington for a number of years prior to 1861. What the founders of this fine institution, which is still sending out many officers for the national army, really intended to do has never been made clear; but Jackson was not without perfectly clear ideas as to what would probably be the outcome. In October, 1855, he wrote of his half-

brother who was contemplating settling in Indiana: "I do not want him to go into a free state if it can be avoided, for he would probably become an abolitionist; and then in the event of trouble between North and South he would stand on one side, and we on the opposite." And again in 1856, when he was about to invest in western lands, he wrote:

And say to him that I design following out his idea of locating some land in a Northern state, but that I am a little afraid to put much there for fear that in the event of a dissolution of the Union that the property of Southerners may be confiscated. I want to locate about three thousand acres, maybe a little more; and if I can please myself, will probably put about one-half of it in a Northern state.

Of Jackson's part in the war not much is said in this book. Perhaps a little that is new is offered in the evidence of his extreme desire to be placed in command of an army to rescue western Virginia from the North, a task at which Lee failed and on which Floyd lost a reputation already on the decline. It was a little strange that this West Virginian, reared in the atmosphere of toil and privation, should have been the hottest advocate of the great planter's cause. But so it was with almost all successful men in the Old South.

On the mooted question of who was responsible for the failure to crush and capture McClellan during the Seven Days' battles in 1862, that open sore which General E. P. Alexander laid bare a few years ago in his *Military Memoirs*, nothing is said or hinted in this volume. Perhaps there are no letters now extant on that subject. But of the cordial dislike of Jackson for Jefferson Davis there is proof enough. Mr. Arnold has added very considerably to the literature of Jackson and he has done his part of the work well and acceptably, without parade or undue hero-worship.

WILLIAM E. DODD.

The Religious History of New England: King's Chapel Lectures.

By JOHN WINTHROP PLATNER and Others. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1917. Pp. v, 356. \$2.50.)

THESE Lowell Institute lectures were given in a venerable place, the earliest chapel of the Church of England in Massachusetts, which after a century became the earliest Unitarian church in America. The co-operation of representatives of eight religious denominations who show unfeigned amiability to one another indicates that the old hostilities are wholly ended and that federative inclinations have begun. If liberty is such a solvent, the pity is that the principle of *cujus regio ejus religio* which Dr. Horr cleverly and fitly applies to the Congregationalist Supremacy did not end the sooner.

The scale of these lectures did not allow much enrichment to our knowledge of fact, though the synoptic view which the reader here obtains is certainly enrichment of knowledge. The story being well estab-

lished there has been time for the reflection and valuation that transmutes knowledge into wisdom, such garnered wisdom as is found in Dean Fenn's thoughtful account of the Unitarian movement or Rufus Jones's illuminating psychological elucidation of Quakerism.

Profitable as these surveys are, it is to be regretted that certain questions concerning this group life have not been more distinctly considered. How, for example, did the Calvinist system begin to lose its hold even in the days of its ablest and most vigorous exposition? Dr. Horr suggests that the weakening of Calvinism among the Baptists was a part of their opposition to the Standing Order, resentment of a policy involving dislike of a theology. An Arminian would answer that here as elsewhere a conscientious study of the Bible bred Arminianism. Dean Hodges fails to notice that the drift to Episcopalianism in the eighteenth century was due in very large part to the Arminianism of its preachers, who were more subject to English influence. As for the breakdown of Calvinism in its Congregationalist stronghold, Dr. Platner wisely, but too briefly, refers to the influence of the eighteenth-century political literature which certainly presented a view of the natural man disruptive of the whole Calvinist system.

How denominational growth was related to differentiations of social class is another pertinent question. The remarkable growth of the Baptists at the end of the eighteenth century is mentioned without explanation. That growth is certainly related to social and political divisions as explained in the *Diary of William Bentley* (II. 127, 425; III. 271). An explanation of this kind is offered by Dean Fenn (p. 112) for the lack of growth of Unitarian churches.

If one asks how denominational organization came out of autonomous congregations, satisfaction is again denied. Dr. Horr's interesting suggestion that foreign missions practically made the Baptists a denomination is probably not the whole truth, and it is surprising to hear nothing of Jedidiah Morse's strenuous efforts to give a semi-Presbyterian organization after the Connecticut model to the Congregationalist churches of Massachusetts, efforts which were intimately connected with the divisions of Congregationalism in 1815.

FRANCIS A. CHRISTIE.

Early Philadelphia: its People, Life, and Progress. By HORACE MATHER LIPPINCOTT. (Philadelphia and London: J. B. Lippincott Company. 1917. Pp. 340. \$6.00.)

THE history of old Philadelphia has been written a number of times. Watson's *Annals*, Scharf and Westcott's *History*, the *Logan Correspondence*, Proud and Gordon, Franklin's papers, the *Records* of the Assembly and Council, and many other books and letters give information concerning colonial and revolutionary times which has been worked over with more or less fidelity by different authors.

This book is somewhat new in its scope and selections. It gives a brief sketch of the founder and the general character of the Quaker settlers, and then takes up the various institutions, churches, theatres, scientific societies, university, banks, hospital, Wistar parties, and many others characteristic of the old town. It is well illustrated and printed. Franklin rightly has a large place and his versatile genius and broad toleration are shown in many directions. It is probably a mistake in speaking of his religious connection to say that "the Quakers claimed him" except as a political ally. He was with them in their fight for liberty from proprietary claims but they separated on the question of martial defense and he was never identified with them as a religious body. It is also an error to place Isaac Norris among the legal lights of the province. It is true he was offered the chief justiceship and declined, but this proves nothing as to his legal learning. He was a business man, a "trader" as Logan calls him rather disrespectfully. His name is misspelled as Morris in the list of overseers of the public school. Other little matters of this sort might be found, but so many errors have been contained in other books about the times (notably *Hugh Wynne*), concerning Quaker traits and local geography, that these seem trivial, and one gets a very fair picture of old scenes and manners from Mr. Lippincott's book. The style is clear and the selection of subjects well proportioned.

The value of such books depends upon their ability to reproduce the spirit and atmosphere of the times with which they deal. A treatise may be technically free from errors and yet fail to give a fair picture. This may result from a real misunderstanding of the temper of the men whose influence determined the character of the institutions, or from a wooden adherence to a skeleton of facts and figures without warm flesh and blood. From both of these tendencies our author is reasonably free and the general impressions seem correct if not very detailed. The lack of detail in certain directions results not from lack of variety in the subjects chosen but rather from an evident intention to keep down the space allotted to each. The character and ideals of the provincial people, with which he is sympathetic, are displayed in the results of their work rather than in direct statements. The analysis of the characteristics of the founder is incomplete, but so will probably be all such analyses till we have time to study the exhaustive collection of his writings now in course of preparation. On the whole the book is a collection of interesting facts, many not generally known, from a variety of sources and placed in an attractive setting.

ISAAC SHARPLESS.

The Readjuster Movement in Virginia. By CHARLES CHILTON PEARSON, Ph.D., Professor of Political Science in Wake Forest College. [Yale Historical Publications, Miscellany, IV.] (New

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXIII.—27.

Haven: Yale University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1917. Pp. viii, 191. \$2.00.)

RECONSTRUCTION and its aftermath in Virginia are but vaguely known even to students of recent American history. There are, to be sure, books on the subjects, Eckenrode's *Political History of Virginia during Reconstruction*, the briefer treatments in *The South in the Building of the Nation*, and a considerable body of reminiscences like William L. Royall's *Reminiscences* (1909), R. E. Withers's *Autobiography* (1907), O'Ferrall's *Forty Years* (1904), and especially John S. Wise's *End of an Era* (1899), and John E. Massey's *Autobiography* (1909). But notwithstanding all this and other writings Virginia since the Civil War still remains an unknown land to most of us.

Professor Pearson's book is an endeavor to clear up this era and let us have in brief space the essential facts and movements. The work begins properly at 1870 and closes with the overthrow of the Mahone machine in 1885. It is an interesting if brief period. There are two problems for the author: to clear up the odds and ends of reconstruction in Virginia and then to show what Virginians, themselves, did with their dismantled and broken commonwealth.

The first of these problems Mr. Pearson handles well enough although the narrative lacks a little in clarity, perhaps because of the very complicated sectional, factional, and racial state of things. The doctors who attended this convalescent but still sorely afflicted community were William Mahone, Gilbert C. Walker, Williams C. Wickham, William H. Ruffner, and H. H. Riddleberger, "a new man" of rather accommodating views. Of these five, and perhaps there were others quite as important, Mahone and Wickham were railroad presidents, or authoritative spokesmen, who looked upon Virginia as a land of promise. They were practical men. Walker was a banker with Virginia bonds in his vaults and not over-particular in his ideals. Ruffner was the only real social physician in the group and he was speedily relegated to a position of harmless respectability. But in spite of the condition of the Old Dominion progress and improvement did come and this Mr. Pearson shows.

But what was finally attempted or accomplished did not depend so much upon what the leaders, just mentioned, did as upon the necessity of relieving the burden of taxation and of finding some way to educate and train the younger generation. This was not an easy task: to reduce taxation and at the same time increase enormously the expenses of government. The people, however, found the remedy. That way was partial repudiation of the debts of the commonwealth, readjusterism or Mahonism, for Mahone did have a part in suggesting the remedy. If the state could, at the behest of the federal government, repudiate enormous debts lawfully contracted, as had been done at the end of the war, why could not the same state repudiate other debts lawfully made and largely owned by Northerners or Englishmen?

To show how this was done is the second part of Mr. Pearson's study and he has made it plain that Mahone put himself at the head of a movement which some one else must have headed if he had not done so, that the plan succeeded brilliantly, though it was "readjusting", not repudiating the debt, according to Mahone. Under wise direction this leader attracted some remarkable men to his standard, John S. Wise and John E. Massey being the ablest of them.

Readjusterism quickly became a national matter and the great Cameron-Conkling-Logan machine, which broke Blaine and indirectly led to the assassination of Garfield, reached out its hand to Mahone and Wise, the first lieutenant of the new Virginia leader. But Garfield also sent flowers to Mahone when he appeared in the senate. The party of "forward-looking men", for Pearson shows that such was the real character of the movement, were found repudiating Virginia obligations in order to get money to educate Virginia youth. And this party found favor with the leaders of the extreme "sound money" men of the North. That is, repudiation in Virginia was endorsed by the party which damned on every occasion the "fool" Greenbackers of the West.

Politics make strange bedfellows. On this score the reviewer might find a little fault with the author. For the book, while it does refer to the national bearings of his subject, does not make clear enough the entanglements and commitments of this bastard Virginia party. In the South readjusterism was Democratic, in Virginia it was progressive, and in the North it was Republican. Bitter indeed was the outcome. Mahone built a machine only less successful than the present ruling dynasty in Virginia. It was as perfect as that of Cameron in Pennsylvania which stands to this day. Yet a slip, a single slip tripped the adroit leader. He mortally offended his ablest lieutenant, Massey; and Massey deserted to the ranks of the incipient Democracy when he was refused the governorship of the state. This was the beginning of the end of Mahoneism.

There is a fairness in the book and an appreciation of the difficulties of politicians in steering the course of any given ship of state that promise well for the future writings of the author. Other studies of pivotal states, South as well as North, for this period would seem to be in order. For him who tells the story of Pennsylvania under the Camerons or of New York under Conkling there awaits a crown of honor. And the Great War has made the period so remote that one need not fear to undertake the investigation of subjects that come down to quite recent years.

Indiana as seen by Early Travelers: a Collection of Reprints from Books of Travel, Letters, and Diaries prior to 1830. Selected and edited by HARLOW LINDLEY, Director Department of Indiana History and Archives, Indiana State Library. [Indiana

Historical Collections.] (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Commission. 1916. Pp. 596. \$1.50.)

THE extensive literature of American travel and description makes it a comparatively simple matter to depict the development of a community by gathering a series of word pictures of varying dates and arranging them in chronological order. When the selection is made with skill and the extracts are fully and carefully edited, the result should be a volume at once attractive to the casual reader and useful to the scholar. Unfortunately the present volume does not measure up to these standards. The selection is fairly satisfactory, although it seems to have been confined to material available in a single library, but the extracts themselves are practically unedited. Travellers who wrote books were fully as unreliable in the early nineteenth century as they are to-day and the collection contains many erroneous and inaccurate statements which should have been corrected by the editor. Moreover, some explanation of the numerous obscure statements and allusions would have made the work not only more useful to the scholar but more interesting to anyone who may attempt to read it. Even the brief notes about the authors, which precede each selection, display very little research. The extracts are arranged in a sort of chronological order, but no attempt seems to have been made to ascertain the actual years in which the information was gathered or the accounts written, reliance being placed apparently on the date of publication of the particular edition at hand. Among the anachronisms noted are: the narrative of Faux (1819) following that of Blane (1822); and Timothy Flint's account of a trip in 1816 placed after several narratives of 1825 and 1826.

The book opens with a selection from Hutchins's *Topographical Description*, the title of which is so abbreviated in the heading as to leave out the pertinent part, "Wabash, Illinois, Mississippi, etc." The biographical note tells something of the later career of Hutchins but fails to state that he was in the West during the years 1766 to 1770, the only date given for the extract being 1778, the year of publication. The second London edition of Imlay's *Topographical Description* furnishes the next selection, but the editor apparently was not aware of the fact that another edition had appeared the previous year, for he speaks of the work as "a very readable and somewhat valuable book for that day—1793". It is not surprising, therefore, that he repeats an error of the edition used and gives the author's first name as George instead of Gilbert. Thomas Ashe's account of the Indiana region in 1806 is presented without any warning about the unreliability of this well-known romancer. Jervis Cutler's *Topographical Description of the State of Ohio, Indiana Territory, and Louisiana* is referred to merely as "Jervasse Cutler's Book of Travels", and the pages of the selection are not given. By far the most serious blunder, however, is the printing of an extract from Hulme's well-known journal of his western tour in 1818 under the heading, "From *A Year's Residence in the United States of*

America by William Cobbett [1828] ", and accompanied by a biographical sketch of Cobbett but with no mention of the real author. Other slips might be noted, but those mentioned are sufficient to make it clear that the editorial work does not measure up to the highest standards of historical and bibliographical scholarship.

The redeeming feature of the book is the inclusion of four hitherto unpublished items. The most valuable of these consists of a series of letters written by William Pelham in 1825 and 1826 which tell of a trip down the Ohio and a visit to the New Harmony community presided over by William Owen. The journal of a trip to Fort Wayne in 1821, by Thomas Scatterwood Teas, is also a valuable contribution. Less significant are the reminiscences of Charles F. Coffin and of Victor Colin Duclos, although the latter contain another account of New Harmony.

In format the book is somewhat crude, but this defect may be explained by the fact that it is the work of the state printer. The index is of the sort one is accustomed to find in legislative journals and similar state publications. There are no maps nor illustrations. On the whole, it would seem that the rejoicing of students of western history over the fact that Indiana has at length begun a series of historical collections must be mixed with a hope that the series, if continued, will improve in quality.

Economic History of Wisconsin during the Civil War Decade. By FREDERICK MERK. [Publications of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Studies, vol. I.] (Madison: The Society. 1916. Pp. 414. \$2.00.)

THIS genuine piece of research, first-rate in every respect, will be welcomed by students of the economic history of the United States. Seldom does a similar work show such a wide and intensive investigation into every conceivable kind of information, an achievement all the more commendable in view of the fact that the author was forced to gather his material from the scattered records of a frontier community.

His object was not primarily to throw light on the four years of the Civil War period itself and thus to contribute toward an understanding of the war crisis, but rather to trace out the various threads of development that ran through that epoch into the future.

However profoundly [says the author's preface] the Civil War affected the economic life of the State and nation, the historian who reviews it should not, it seems to me, limit his discussion to the four years in which the armies of the North and the South were clashing on the battlefield. If he does, his picture will be but a static, panoramic view, and not, as it should be, a moving film of events. My design in this volume has been to limit myself as closely as possible to the period of the Civil War. Yet when it seemed desirable I have not hesitated to range over the entire period between the two years of financial crisis, 1857 and 1873. Developments brought to a close during the war I have attempted to trace to their origin; changes begun during the war I have briefly carried either to their conclusion or to the point at which it has seemed profitable to leave them.

Necessarily the more restricted the field, the more detailed can the work be made and the more can it be connected with the past and future.

The most solid contributions of the book are, first, the chapter on railroad farm mortgages, the agitation over which, in the words of the author, was "a characteristic frontier movement", "clearly an attempt at repudiation", "the revolt of an organized debtor class against an absent creditor class"; second, the three chapters on railroad consolidation, anti-monopoly revolt, and the genesis of railroad regulation in the United States; and, third, that on banking, which is a detailed and masterly account of wildcat banking in one of the states which suffered most from its ravages. Other chapters, though not so new and informing, deal with agriculture, lumbering, mining, manufacturing, labor, trade, and the commerce of the Mississippi and the Great Lakes. The treatment of lumbering and the flouring industry, of hop-growing and cheese-making, is very detailed.

Although the author does not display any lack of knowledge of the national field, the reader will find in his work little correlation of the various movements in Wisconsin with those in the nation at large. It is a fair question whether on such subjects as farm mortgages, wildcat banking, railroad development, etc., the national situation ought not to be dealt with at least in a general way. Again, although the city of Milwaukee is constantly referred to in the course of the 391 pages, the various references to the marvellous growth of that city during the war decade are nowhere thrown together into a connected whole.

The literary style of the book is smooth and interesting, and the difficult task of handling figures in a text is met in a satisfactory manner. There is a careful index, but for a bibliography the reader must use the foot-notes.

It is to be hoped that the book may find imitation in the appearance of similar works on the economic life, during the same period, of such pivotal states as New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and California, on which there is an abundance of material. Indeed, even the economic life of single cities during the war period, such as New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, and San Francisco, would prove an equally rich field for the patient investigator endowed with Mr. Merk's ability and industry.

E. D. FITE.

The Missions and Missionaries of California. By Fr. ZEPHYRIN ENGELHARDT, O.F.M. Volumes III.-IV. *Upper California*, parts II.-III. *Index* to volumes II.-IV. (San Francisco: The James H. Barry Company. 1916. Pp. xxvii, 817. \$12.00 for the set.)

Books about the missions of California are almost numberless, but however many may be written the work of Father Engelhardt will con-

tinue to have a special interest and value. Of the *Missions and Missionaries* there have now appeared four large volumes with a supplementary volume containing the index to volumes II. to IV. To understand the author's project it is necessary to observe that what we now have consists of the general history of the missions in Lower (vol. I.) and Upper (vols. II.-IV.) California, and that the general narrative is to be complemented later by local histories of each of the several missions.

What Father Engelhardt gives in these large volumes is a detailed history of California down to the American occupation written from the point of view of the Franciscan missionaries. Conceivably, there are four different angles from which the history of this outlying province of Spain and Mexico might be presented. Ordinarily, the historical student will be disposed to follow the activities and the development of the political power or secular government; and from this standpoint the religious will appear as almost uniformly intrusive and exasperating. On the other hand, the story may be told by the missionary, and in this case the politico-military authorities will stand out as inconsiderate, meddlesome, and overbearing. Again, there is the point of view of the Mexican-Spanish settlers and their descendants, the *paisanos*, the Europeanized population engaged in the attempt to make California their home. Of this group, more particularly, Bancroft has been the spokesman; but to Father Engelhardt they seem, in the main, to deserve thorough-going condemnation as covetous conspirators against the missions. Lastly, one might imagine an instructive account written from the standpoint of the unfortunate Indians who, without desire or volition of their own, suddenly found themselves inextricably involved in activities the object of which they certainly could not understand. However we may regard the story it is a painful and unedifying exhibition of the mutual jealousies and recriminations of a few Europeans isolated together in one of the farthest corners of the earth.

It is only fair to say that the missionaries believed whole-heartedly that they were called upon to act as the guardians of the natives, and to take the best means to assure their welfare, both temporal and eternal. One can have little sympathy, indeed, with the ultra-Protestant writers who infer from every incident that the padres considered their own advantage and utilized the labor and property of the Indians for their own personal aggrandizement. But this does not mean that we can accept all the contentions of the Franciscan historian.

Father Engelhardt's history has conspicuous merits: he has spared neither pains nor care in the examination of the voluminous records and literature, and he has exhausted patience in his purpose to present as accurate an account of what really happened in California as can now be constructed. Furthermore, it represents completely and for all time the spirit of self-sacrifice that animated the missionary in his arduous undertaking. Let us then admit fully and without hesitation these admirable characteristics of Father Engelhardt's work, for we cannot

accept, or even pass over, the spirit in which it is written. I have discussed this matter with Father Engelhardt, for whose intellectual integrity I have the highest respect, and I am aware of his belief that there is an unavoidable responsibility placed upon him to condemn unsparingly any deviation from the truth in other historians. Indeed, what we have here is the theory of Lord Acton put into practice by one of whose sincerity there can be no doubt. Unhappily, however, Father Engelhardt cannot understand that such judgments are personal, and that a certain amount of suppression of righteous indignation would have gone far to make his statement of the case more widely acceptable. As it is, those who feel with Father Engelhardt will doubtless be gratified, while those who do not will be repelled by his iterated anathemas. One would have looked for something more of charity towards the enemies of his order than is to be found in the painstaking and memorable work of this single-minded and devoted follower of St. Francis.

F. J. T.

- Memorias de Fray Servando Teresa de Mier, del Convento de Santo Domingo, de México, Diputado al Primer Congreso Constituyente de la República.* Prólogo de Don ALFONSO REYES. [Biblioteca Ayacucho, bajo la Dirección de Don Rufino Blanco-Fombona.] (Madrid: Sociedad Española de Librería. [1917]. Pp. xxii, 430. 8 pesetas.)
- La Creación de Bolivia.* By SABINO PINILLA. Prólogo y notas de ALCIDES ARGUEDAS. [Biblioteca Ayacucho.] (*Ibid.* [1917]. Pp. 371. 7.50 pesetas.)
- La Dictadura de O'Higgins.* By M. L. AMUNÁTEGUI and B. VICUÑA MACKENNA. [Biblioteca Ayacucho.] (*Ibid.* [1917]. Pp. 400. 7.50 pesetas.)
- Cuadros de la Historia Militar y Civil de Venezuela desde el Descubrimiento y Conquista de Guayana hasta la Batalla de Carabobo.* By LINO DUARTE LEVEL. [Biblioteca Ayacucho.] (*Ibid.* [1917]. Pp. 462. 8 pesetas.)

To judge from the statements that accompanied the initial volume of the *Biblioteca Ayacucho*, the primary object of the collection was to reprint, either in the original or in translation, memoirs or descriptive accounts written by contemporaries of the Spanish-American struggle for independence and dealing with the events of that period. Although the available stock of such treatises is by no means exhausted, the editor appears to have decided upon at least a temporary change of procedure. Accordingly the subject-matter of the four volumes under consideration either does not relate to the actual era of emancipation, or is the product of historians living at a much later time. In the

opinion of the reviewer this departure from the original intent of the series is regrettable. Students of the period could not fail to acknowledge the great utility of the existing reprints. Toward new editions of secondary works, however meritorious, their attitude must be less favorable; for the reproduction of accounts of that sort could have waited with advantage until the contemporary testimony had been more fully drawn upon.

Fray Servando Teresa de Mier, with whom the first of the volumes is concerned, was a Mexican ecclesiastic whose character and career made him one of the most remarkable personages of his time. His zeal for novel interpretations of religious belief, his brilliant but erratic mind, his versatile pen, and his gift of satire brought him a large number of trials and tribulations. An enthusiastic lover of his country, an ardent advocate of its independence, and yet aware of its unfitness to imitate in its political organization a nation so advanced as the United States, he incurred the disfavor of Mexican radicals in spite of the troubles he had undergone at the hands of the Spaniards.

The volume is a partial reprint of a work published at Monterrey, Mexico, in 1876. It contains an "Apología" of Mier for his famous sermon of 1794, in which he declared substantially that the Spaniards did not introduce Christianity into the New World. It was the apostle St. Thomas, under the name of "Quetzalcoatl", who first preached it! If this were true, the chief moral claim of Spain to dominion in America would be destroyed. For this bold assertion, accordingly, the young Dominican was condemned to banishment. Then follows a lively narration of his adventures in various European countries from 1795 to 1805. Entertaining as this portion of the text is—as a record of the activities of a rather eccentric individual—the rightfulness of its inclusion in the *Biblioteca Ayacucho* is less obvious than would have been that of some of the other works of Mier cited by Sr. Reyes in his scholarly introduction.

La Creación de Bolivia contains the fragments of a work written by an eminent jurist and diplomat of that country, and now printed for the first time. It consists of four complete chapters, one that is unfinished, and a collection of notes. The purpose of the author was to explain the origin and development of Bolivian nationality from the earliest times to the deposition of Sucre from the presidency. To this end Dr. Pinilla furnishes at the outset an interesting and well-drawn picture of the actual elements out of which that nationality was to be constructed. In succeeding chapters he describes the political situation from 1824 to 1826, with an abundance of philosophic comment and an elaborate characterization of the men who were foremost in the public eye at the time. Noteworthy in particular is his detailed account of the "deliberative assembly", that had to determine whether or not Bolivia should have a separate national existence, and of the constitutional convention that had to consider the remarkable instrument of government

prepared by Bolívar for the republic that was to bear his name. Even in its incomplete state the work certainly affords a capital interpretation of the events of the period, enabling the reader to understand the nature of the tremendous difficulties that confronted the new state at the beginnings of its independent career.

The prologue by Alcides Arguedas, the noted Bolivian littérateur, is a fine specimen of historical prose. In its analysis of Pinilla's work it stresses, with much apparent justification, the claims of Bolívar to consideration as the real founder of the Bolivian nation, contrary to the views expressed by René Moreno and other partizans of Sucre. A biographical sketch of the author concludes the volume.

Miguel Luis Amunátegui and Benjamín Vicuña Mackenna were the most prolific of the publicists and historians of Chile who flourished about the middle of the nineteenth century. In 1853 the former, while a member of the Faculty of Philosophy and Humanities, presented to the University of Chile a "memoria" entitled *La Dictadura de O'Higgins*. Seven years later Vicuña Mackenna published *El Ostracismo del Jeneral Don Bernardo O'Higgins*. In 1882 these were combined in a third edition appearing with two separate title-pages, one bearing the caption of the work of 1853, the other that of *Vida del Jeneral Don Bernardo O'Higgins (su Dictadura, su Ostracismo)*. The volume in the *Biblioteca Ayacucho* is a reprint of this third edition. Though a standard work of its kind and well-known to historical students, an explanation of its origin and of the special motives that induced the editor to reproduce it in a series devoted presumably to contemporary memoirs would have seemed desirable. Nothing of the sort, however, is vouchsafed.

In the case of the treatise by Lino Duarte Level the absence of any editorial message to the reader is even more noticeable. Despite the elaborate title, which might convey the impression that an original work composed by an eye-witness of the later events of which it treats was being presented, in point of fact the volume is simply a reprint of a species of text-book, entitled *Historia Patria* and published at Carácas in 1911. The author, an exile from Venezuela and resident in New York, wrote it in 1908. Not only is no account of the provenance of the work given, but a variety of changes have been introduced into the arrangement of the subject-matter, so as to make it more strictly chronological in sequence. New sections, furthermore, have been introduced and provided with appropriate designations. In one case the existing title itself was altered by inserting "Irish" for "British" as the name for the foreign legion. The author's preface, also, has been converted into a foot-note.

Serviceable as the book may be to the schools of Venezuela, it appears to have no especial merits that would warrant its inclusion in the *Biblioteca Ayacucho*. Nor are the qualifications of the writer as a scientific historian much in evidence. He has culled his material from the accepted secondary sources. His style is fluent and his diction, at

times, highly rhetorical. He has written a readable book, though hardly an original contribution to historical literature worthy of the place to which it has been assigned.

WILLIAM R. SHEPHERD.

MINOR NOTICES

Caesar: the Gallic War. With an English Translation by H. J. Edwards, C.B., Fellow and Tutor of Peterhouse, Cambridge, [Loeb Classical Library.] (London, William Heinemann, New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1917, pp. xxii, 620, \$1.50.) This is another unit in that *Loeb Classical Library*, which is doing so much to contradict the assertion that the "dead" languages and their literature are no longer with us. Truth to tell, however, only a couple of decades ago a volume with the text of Caesar's *Commentaries* on one page and a tolerably literal translation on the other confronting the first, the whole served up as an honest book and not as a subterranean "trot", would have produced wrath among the schoolmasters; even now it may excite the doubts of the timorous. To all however who really desire that the cause of the classics should not be lost it becomes a most valuable re-enforcement. The interests of Latin studies are decidedly advanced when a good translation of Caesar is hailed as a guide and not as a bandit.

Mr. Edwards's translation of the eight books of the *Gallic War* has been well executed. It is very much superior as a piece of English, as well as being founded upon a considerably better text, to the old McDevitte and Bohn translation of ancient date in the familiar Bohn library. The language is smooth and easy, although sometimes possibly a little too diffuse to carry over the compact phrases of the Latin. The translation however compares very favorably with the recent version by T. Rice Holmes. I have not been able to compare it with the other modern attempt by F. P. Long.

The *Gallic War* constitutes a fairly self-interpreting narrative. Mr. Edwards provides very few notes and those of only one or two lines each. In an introduction and two appendixes, however, he undertakes to supply sufficient explanatory apparatus to make the story intelligible to the much beset "average reader". In frankness it must be said that this apparatus is less satisfactory than the translation. It is too brief to be always lucid, and Caesar is too great a man to have his genius summarized and disposed of in one and a half small pages. Furthermore the appendix on the Roman army, although containing a great amount of compact information, yet in the constant attempt at brevity sometimes commits itself to general statements which seem open to so many exceptions as to make them misleading to the uninitiated. One gets the impression that this apparatus was prepared rather out of a sense of duty than as an essential part of the volume.

On the other hand the maps, nine in number, are excellent, and some of them seem decidedly superior to the corresponding maps that are inserted in the ordinary "Caesar texts" in our high-schools.

WILLIAM STEARNS DAVIS.

The Gradual Acceptance of the Copernican Theory of the Universe. By Dorothy Stimson, Ph.D. (New York, Baker and Taylor Company, 1917, pp. 147, \$1.25.) This intelligent and entertaining little study sketches the rise of the heliocentric theory, from the Greeks onward, as well as its advocacy by Copernicus and its vicissitudes down to our own day. That in so vast a field she has used but a part of the literature—she has missed even books so important as those of Pierre Duhem—goes without saying; but she has moused to excellent purpose and has handled her materials with insight and sound sense. That the volume is a thesis for the doctorate may perhaps be inferred from the "Ph.D." following the author's name, and the thanks in her preface show the book an outcome of the teaching of Professor Robinson at Columbia. It may be warmly commended to the American editors whose ready acceptance of the denial that theology has ever hampered science has of late made some of us rub our eyes.

There is of course in the work much that testifies to the author's immaturity; but what most tempts to censure is a carelessness in the minutiae of the scholar's work—in punctuation, in the spelling of foreign names, in the quoting and the abbreviation of titles, in the reading of proof—which (though some effort has clearly been given to these) shows a lack in the training fairly to be expected in the holder of so advanced a degree. "Copernician" is almost as frequent as "Copernican"; and a writer who is happily not yet "the late President White" will be puzzled by the ascription to him of a History of the "Welfare" of Science. But such slips, though not few, are slight flecks in so live a book. Its last forty pages are devoted to a bibliography and to translated extracts from Ptolemy, Copernicus, Bodin, and the Louvain professor Feyens.

G. L. B.

The Revival of the Conventual Life in the Church of England in the Nineteenth Century. By Ralph W. Sockman, M.A. (New York, the Author, 1917, pp. 230.) Mr. Sockman makes it clear in his preface that no field work in England was done for his sympathetic study of the revival of the conventual life in the Church of England in the nineteenth century—that all the research was done in the libraries of New York. This is evident again at several places in the book itself: for there is a complete absence of any local color when Mr. Sockman is describing the life of the conventual establishments in urban communities and in rural England that have come into existence since 1847. To some extent this lack of local description impairs the value of the book; for

it is difficult to realize to the full the mission which these conventual establishments assigned to themselves without some description of their environment, and the local conditions, urban or rural, that surrounded them. This much said, nothing but commendation remains for Mr. Sockman's interesting study of a comparatively new phase in the life and service of the Established Church in England. He has moved into a field that hitherto had had very little systematic tillage; and his work in this new ground has been singularly successful. His history of the thirty conventual establishments—all connected with the Church of England—that came into existence between 1847 and 1899 is an excellent piece of work. These establishments are likely to extend themselves or to be added to from time to time; for the war will almost certainly have its influence on the movement of which Mr. Sockman writes with so much sympathetic care. The second half of the book may thus, before long, come to need revision and addition. But the first half is so complete, so comprehensive, and so thoroughly well done, that it will long stand as a really serviceable contribution to English ecclesiastical history, and incidentally to the history of some aspects of English thought and social life from the Restoration to the early years of Queen Victoria's reign. The remarkable care with which Mr. Sockman has traced and described the various influences and forces working towards a revival of the conventual life, under sanction of the Established Church; obviously gives the book this permanent value. There is a bibliography of twenty pages but no index.

British Foreign Policy in Europe to the End of the 19th Century. A Rough Outline. By H. E. Egerton, M.A., Beit Professor of Colonial History and Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford. (London, Macmillan and Company, 1917, pp. x, 440, 6 sh.) If the people are not instructed in history as a result of the war, it will not be the fault of the scholars. At any rate the supply of manuals, larger or smaller, covering mainly recent history but some of them reaching back into a longer past, has been greatly multiplied in the last two years. Professor Egerton's book is among the shorter of these manuals, and it is addressed to the better informed among general readers. It must be judged not by what one should expect of a complete history of British foreign policy but by its avowed purpose. It is in the first place plainly stated in the preface to be a book "dealing with British foreign policy apart from a narrative of events". To this purpose the author keeps surprisingly close, with the result that those who are not familiar with the events, or who do not accompany their reading with a narrative history, will find much that is blind to them. The object of the book is to show the motives and purposes which have guided British foreign policy and to do so as nearly as possible in the words of the men who have had most influence in shaping the policy. It contains therefore numerous extracts, especially from the speeches and letters of statesmen and diplomats in

which they have urged or defended their ideas. The student and the teacher will find in this the greatest usefulness of the book. It is a chronological index to the sources where will be found the best and most authoritative statements of intention and motive made by the men who determined events in this field, and it gives to one's hand what we may conclude to be the most telling of these statements.

In the second place the object of the book is frankly a defense of British foreign policy. Professor Egerton is marshalling the evidence which shows "that the policy of the country on the whole has been singularly honest and straightforward" (p. 2). The book certainly gives that impression, and not by glozing over the bad spots. No real defense is attempted of the action of England in seizing the Danish fleet in 1807, or her part in bringing on the Crimean War, or in the settlement at its close, and the best that can be found to say for the Spanish war which began in 1739 is that "its real *raison d'être* was altogether rational, the expansion of British trade and shipping".

It may be added that such an interpretation of British foreign policy as we are here given would have been impossible fifteen years ago, because the revelation which has been made of Germany's plans of world empire throws back a light upon all that happened, at least since the beginning of the struggle with Louis XIV., which enables us now to see connections and consequences before obscure and changes the relative emphasis to be given to items in the code of international ethics.

Origins of the Triple Alliance. Three Lectures. By Archibald Cary Coolidge, Professor of History in Harvard University. (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1917, pp. vi, 236, \$1.25.) This volume is a development of the Barbour-Page Lectures for 1916 at the University of Virginia. Its outstanding merit is lucidity of presentation and in this respect the book, considering its small compass and the involved nature of its subject, is a model of exposition. Professor Coolidge divides it into three chapters, following the main episodes which marked the development of Bismarckian diplomacy from 1871 until 1882. The first sketches the state of international relations in 1871 and the beginnings of the League of the Three Emperors; a fine sense of dramatic values has led the author to conclude the chapter with the war-scare of 1875, which is the first presage of Bismarck's ultimate failure to transform the league into a solid alliance. The second chapter is devoted to the Eastern crises of 1876-1878. As might be expected Professor Coolidge's treatment of Balkan and Turkish affairs is the liveliest and most interesting portion of his work; upon it he lays particular emphasis, for it was in the Near East that the conflicting interests of Russia and Austria-Hungary became inexorably clear and that Bismarck's original dream of an alliance of empires was finally shattered. The third chapter shows us Bismarck compelled to choose between Russia and Austria, presents the reasons for the chancellor's preference for the latter power

as an ally, and describes his ultimate decision to substitute Italy for the former. For the most part the author does not depart widely from the generally accepted interpretation of events: he makes it clear that the combination of the three empires was Bismarck's real preference and that the Triple Alliance as finally formed was a *pis aller*; he is frank in recognizing that Bismarckian policy from 1876 to 1878 was a failure; to the rôle played by Andrassy he ascribes greater importance than historical writers have usually accorded.

We may regret that Professor Coolidge has chosen to make his style quite so severely pragmatic and that he has not given his personal opinions at greater length, especially in the case of the Balkan settlement of 1878. The ordinary student would also have been grateful for a list of authorities other than the few referred to in the sparse footnotes. The note on page 219 which gives the date of the publication of the text of the Triple Alliance as 1883 (instead of 1888) is obviously a misprint.

Devant l'Histoire: Causes connues et ignorées de la Guerre. Par Paul Giraud, Docteur en Droit. (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1917, pp. xix, 263, 3 fr. 50.) The descriptive subtitle of this book is hardly accurate, for the author does not attempt to introduce any war-breeding factors which have not already received careful attention by many writers; and the major portion of his work is devoted merely to an analysis of the diplomatic negotiations which failed to prevent the conflict. His sources of information are restricted almost entirely to the official multi-colored documents issued by the governments of the warring nations, all of which have been dissected and analyzed many times. The manuscript was obviously prepared before the revelations furnished by the Russian trials of last spring and by the publication of the Kaiser's telegram of August 10, 1914, to President Wilson. M. Giraud's study is none the less an excellent example of careful and exact analysis and should not be regarded as superfluous. It is more scholarly in method than Beck's *The Evidence in the Case*, and more convenient for the general reader than the longer analyses contained in Headlam's *History of Twelve Days* and Stowell's *Diplomacy of the War*; at the same time it is more complete than the excellent but brief *Qui a voulu la Guerre?* of Durkheim and Denis. M. Giraud has also included a brief discussion of the German theory of *Einkreisung*, a criticism of the German claim to a place in the sun, and an illuminating collection of *dicta* illustrating the frame of mind characteristic of typical German rulers, warriors, publicists, and pastors. The conclusions reached are identical with those now generally held in this country. The author does not insist that the German government knew in advance the exact terms of the Austrian note of July 23, but he considers it certain that German diplomats were aware of its general character and therefore must stand responsible for the consequences. He believes that during the course of the crisis Ger-

many played a consistently hypocritical rôle, and that when Count Berchtold changed his tone on July 30 and declared his willingness again to take up conversations with Russia, Germany destroyed this last chance of a peaceful settlement by her utterly unjustifiable ultimatum to Russia.

The book is evidently issued as part of a campaign of patriotic education and may serve as a model to those American writers who are anxious that our nation shall know the truth about the war. The author's language, in his verdict of German guilt, is strong, but he takes care to give chapter and verse to support each of his conclusions.

England and the War (1914-1915). By André Chevrillon. With a Preface by Rudyard Kipling. (Garden City and New York, Doubleday, Page, and Company, 1917, pp. xxi, 250, \$1.60.) The war has been a revelation of England to the world and to herself, and of the world to England. For many years there has been a rather general feeling outside of England, and to a considerable extent within England as well, that there had taken place a decided decline of her national vigor and spirit, that she would be found very reluctant to enter upon a great war, and would be proved by a war to have become more or less degenerate. The Boer War, which was in some important ways a preparation for the present war, should have proved this belief unfounded, but England's military difficulties and military failures in that war obscured the evidence.

In a quite different direction, and unconsciously in this case, England was out of harmony with the world, or with the greater portion of the world. Without reasoning about it and without exhortation or resolution, she had gone some distance ahead of most other nations in the application of the standards of individual morality to national action. A great change had slowly come about in this respect in half a century, whose roots lie much farther back in the past. Because this change had been so gradually coming about it was not clearly understood either at home or abroad. Particularly did England fail to understand how far Germany had lagged behind herself. As M. Chevrillon says:

The war had found her in ignorance and apathy; she knew nothing but herself, she hated nobody; she did not even know she had enemies, hardly knew the full meaning of that word. . . . During the last ten years those who governed and represented England had done their best to preserve the peace; nay, had been inspired by purest pacifism. All their political activity had been directed towards the ideals of humanity, fraternity, and justice. Germany's long-accumulated hatred and envy burst out with such brutality, that England was at last awakened from her dream of idealism (p. 223).

England now knows the world, and she knows her own strength, and the world knows her.

It is the story of this awakening that M. Chevrillon tells. His book is not history in the technical sense. But it is the raw material of history and of the greatest value. It is the account of an eye-witness who watched the process under the best of conditions, with every facility given him, and with a keenness of insight equalled by few political observers. The French quickness of understanding and ability to put oneself in another's place come here to the advantage of the future historian. The theme of the book is really how an unprepared democracy gets itself ready to meet on equal terms a prepared autocracy, and it is doubtful if, in general or in detail, the description will ever be better done. The story of the discoveries and experiences which led up to conscription is especially significant and instructive and takes up half the book, but in other things also, the growth and power of public opinion, the reasons for England's slowness in getting under way, the doubtful and changing attitude of labor, the author is equally illuminating. The account closes with the end of the year 1915.

G. B. A.

Balfour, Viviani and Joffre: their Speeches and other Public Utterances in America, and those of Italian, Belgian, and Russian Commissioners during the Great War, with an Account of the Arrival of our Warships and Soldiers in England and France under Admiral Sims and General Pershing, April 21, 1917-July 4, 1917. By Francis W. Halsey. (New York and London, Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1917, pp. v, 369, \$1.50.) Mr. Halsey recites in chronological order the coming of these commissions and their speeches and doings in the United States and Canada, which are followed by a chapter on the arrival of the first American forces in England and France. There is no preface, so the purpose of the book—a record of events or merely a pleasant patriotic excursion—can be inferred only from the contents. The writer's sources are mainly the news columns of the daily papers together with some references to the *Congressional Record* and Canadian Parliamentary Reports.

Newspaper "clippings", it would seem, should hardly be given unedited to posterity. They could not include, in this case, much that was of importance concerning these visits; hence the record is neither complete nor accurate. We read, however, "The distinguished visitors were offered lemonade in tin cups and buttermilk in sanitary paper cups" (p. 145) and "As the crowd passed the Equitable Building someone sent down a shower of paper that looked like confetti" (p. 237). Such trivialities prevent the reader from appreciating properly the Italian appeal for coal or the Russian declarations of policy. Much, indeed, of value in regard to the state of mind of all our Allies could be gleaned by carefully winnowing the speeches of their representatives, and had the compiler assisted us better in this process we should have appreciated his book more. Its chief worth would have been that it made easily

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXIII.—28.

accessible and inspiring the statements of the commissioners, but this the author has not fully succeeded in doing.

Index and illustrations are both lacking. The former we should look for in a serious production, the latter in a popular one. The grammatical and typographical errors (p. 335, line 25; p. 337, line 26, etc.) might perhaps be expected from the sources used.

A. I. A.

Jan Smuts: being a Character Sketch of Gen. the Hon. J. C. Smuts, K.C., M.L.A., Minister of Defence, Union of South Africa. By N. Levi. (London and New York, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1917, pp. vi, 310, \$2.50.) This book is called a character sketch but it is really an excellent political biography. The author is, I take it, a Boer who has hardly forgotten the Jameson raid but is thoroughly committed to the English connection, although no Anglophile. "We have been going very fast in South Africa", Smuts once said. It has been a progress marked by bitter controversy and Smuts has been in the midst of it. His campaigns, his addresses, his political programmes and their effect upon the public, upon his party and the opposition, these are the matters of the biography. The author uses speeches and the press comments upon them in such a way as to bring out the strength and weakness of this great South African and does it so deftly that one scarcely realizes where praise ends and blame begins. If his account is chronological, he never forgets that he is attempting to explain Smuts, the political Smuts in particular. Boswell was not more interested in Doctor Johnson. He makes a good case for Smuts, but the passing months prove increasingly that a good case can be made.

It is a pity that he takes so much for granted. Familiar himself with the intricacies of South African politics, he is too sure that his many allusions will be understood. He might well at several points have made an analysis of party groupings—for which he is qualified as few men. To test his accuracy would be impossible short of London or Pretoria. His sources are the South African newspapers—he has not overlooked the cartoons—and a close personal acquaintance with Jan Smuts. But his pages evidence such restraint, he is so dispassionate in dealing with controversial matters, where he must have earnest convictions, he has used so many materials where he might have been tempted to write from memory, that one gains confidence in him.

The work gives one the flavor of South Africa. It is not only the racy English idiom enlivened with fresh South African phrases, nor the imagination that loves to play with odd figures of speech drawn from the author's own experience, and plays with them like a Meredith, sometimes possibly too daringly; it is the insight into the Boers, the sympathetic insight of a man who has seen a wider world only to estimate his own better. Few men in their lifetimes have been so fortunate in their biographers as General Smuts.

WALLACE NOTESTEIN.

The Rebirth of Russia. By Isaac F. Marcossou. (New York, John Lane Company, 1917, pp. xvi, 208, \$1.25.) True to its "Foreword", this volume is "frankly journalistic", and has no "serious historic pretensions". It is one of the many appearing and yet to appear, no doubt, upon this momentous theme. Unfortunately for the writer, especially in a journalistic narrative, he did not reach Petrograd till after the "Great Upheaval" was an accomplished fact, when he "found the capital delirious with freedom". He was obliged to accept from others the narration of the events of those long, dark, uncertain days, the prelude of the Revolution, as well as of the Revolution itself, and in contrast with other journalists living on the spot was in this respect at a great disadvantage. Such a journalist would not have misjudged, for instance, the amount of revolutionary sentiment and the freedom with which it was expressed in Petrograd just prior to the outbreak, as is to be seen on page 35 *et seq.* in this volume. There are a few other inaccuracies which may be set down just as probably to misprint, as for instance "Arch-Protagonist" on page 22, where it is likely the opposite was intended.

Those who have followed these absorbing events in the press from day to day—and who has not?—will be especially grateful for a more rationalized and consecutive account in book form than the daily press could possibly afford. This volume makes it easier to comprehend the existence of German influence at court, and the means of accomplishing its purpose. While one cannot, without a knowledge of the Russian psychology, comprehend the establishment of the dual government, the abolition of the death penalty in the army, the dismissal of their most valued and trusted leaders in the midst of war, and the deliberation with which they set about the well-nigh impossible task of constructing a new and untried form of government during such a crisis, the turmoil is at least fascinating, and the narration thereof, spite of our impatience with their inaction, is most thankfully received.

The reader has reason to be grateful to this volume also for the pen portraits of the really great men who have come to the front in this world drama, especially Miliukov, Rodzianko, Lvov, and Gutchkov, and other members of the first provisional government. His characterization of Kerensky as "a great leader" does not seem to be borne out by his account of the man, nor are we ready to say yet that this will be the verdict of history. We seem to be still waiting for the great leader, six months after the emergence of Kerensky and the Bolsheviks with whom he must be always associated.

This sentence in the opening paragraph of the concluding chapter carries a much-needed and well-deserved assurance to this side of the water: "A people who could show restraint when a long and poignant past cried out for vengeance are capable of still greater things."

J. E. CONNER.

The American Indians North of Mexico. By W. H. Miner. (Cambridge, University Press, 1917, pp. xi, 169, \$1.00.) Specialists are so seldom willing to devote any attention to the production of popular works that attempts on the part of non-professionals to meet the need for such publications should be treated leniently. In the present instance we are able to be more than lenient because Mr. Miner has been well advised in his choice of authorities and has escaped most of the pitfalls into which other would-be popular writers frequently fall. As he has compressed his treatment into 169 small pages it is apparent that—although he has confined himself to that part of America north of Mexico—all that is attempted is a popular primer, the merest taste of the subject, something to give the lay reader a little glimpse into the lives of those peoples who preceded us in the occupation of the western continent; and it must be viewed only in that light.

A work of this kind might be handled either in a series of general discussions of the material culture, sociology, mythology, and so on, of the peoples of the area taken as a whole, or in the form of a bundle of specific descriptions of certain selected tribes. Mr. Miner, however, has chosen a middle course. After a brief introduction in which he outlines the physiographic background of American Indian life, he begins the main part of his task with a short chapter in which certain "General Facts" regarding the origin and distribution of the Indians are set forth, and follows it with a longer account of Indian Sociology. At this point he suddenly shifts to the specific method in discussions of the Plains Indians and the Indians of the Southwest, but in his final chapter on Indian Mythology he reverts to the generalizing method. Some notes, a very good bibliography, and an adequate index close the volume.

While a methodological mixture of the above kind in a work of this character has much to recommend it, it would have been better had the specific narratives been appended to the general discussion instead of being sandwiched into the middle of it. The former would also have been improved considerably by a chapter on material culture and economic life. Yet with all this, and in spite of occasional errors and some awkwardness in expression, Mr. Miner has produced a very readable booklet which may be used by the lay inquirer with comparative safety.

JOHN R. SWANTON.

Apprenticeship and Apprenticeship Education in Colonial New England and New York. By Robert Francis Seybolt, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Education in the University of Wisconsin. [Teachers College, Columbia University Contributions to Education, no. 85.] (New York, Teachers College, 1917, pp. 121, \$1.00.) The title reveals accurately the character of the book. After an introductory chapter on English apprenticeship, Professor Seybolt traces from such records as laws, indentures, and wills, the development of the institution in colonial New England and New York. He emphasizes apprenticeship not so much

as training for a trade but as a means for providing a general elementary education. His main contention is that apprenticeship was "the most fundamental educational institution of the period" (p. 22).

The first chapter is written with apparent care and fortified with many references to sources. But it furnishes no real contribution to historical knowledge; all the points emphasized have been covered by other writers. Of specific assertions one at least may be called in question: the statement that by 1400 apprenticeship "was practised by most guilds, and required by most towns" (p. 4). The evidence furnished, drawn chiefly from London records, certainly fails to substantiate this statement.

Succeeding chapters, more valuable in content, are inferior in style. Not only is the writing heavy, but it is diffuse and involved. Oft-quoted indentures weary with their sameness (see pp. 29, 34, 58-59, 88-89, and appendix A). Certain material in the text should have been condensed, put in the foot-notes, or omitted. Failure to summarize important points confuses the reader.

From a winding and thorny path, however, Professor Seybolt finally comes into the Promised Land. In the last and best chapter his findings emerge from the obscurity of muddy style. He brings out the significance of the Massachusetts Bay Act of 1642, a departure from English precedent, "the first compulsory education law in America" (p. 105). He shows how the example of Massachusetts in making masters responsible for the elementary education of their apprentices, either personally or through local schools, was followed in other colonies. It may indeed be questioned whether "the apprenticeship system took care of the entire problem of public elementary education during the colonial period" (p. 107); parents as well as masters had to provide instruction. But in general his conclusions are of real value not only to the specialist in the history of education but to the student of social and economic conditions in the colonies as well.

JONATHAN F. SCOTT.

The Life of Robert Hare, an American Chemist (1781-1858). By Edgar Fahs Smith, Provost of the University of Pennsylvania. (Philadelphia and London, J. B. Lippincott Company, 1917, pp. viii, 508, \$5.00.) Robert Hare was born in Philadelphia in 1781; he studied chemistry under Woodhouse at the University of Pennsylvania; in 1818 he was appointed professor of chemistry in the University of Pennsylvania, a position which he held for twenty-nine years; he died in 1858, eleven years after he gave up teaching. There are some points about Hare's career which appeal to the student of history and psychology. Hare was admittedly the best chemist of his day in America and he was a man who would have ranked high in any country at any time. In spite of that, his name is practically unknown to-day; and few people would know anything about him if it were not for this biography. Sometimes

a man ranks high among his contemporaries without ever doing anything striking which should be referred to by succeeding generations, but Hare was not of this type. When only twenty-one he invented the oxyhydrogen blow-pipe which gave the highest temperature then known and which is a regular piece of laboratory apparatus to-day. We might just as well call it the Hare blow-pipe as to speak of the Bunsen lamp and the Bunsen cell; but Bunsen's name has come down to us and Hare's has not. If Hare had been born in Germany, his name would be known to-day in connection with the blow-pipe. The difference seems to be that Bunsen had many students who published articles while Hare had very few.

Hare also invented two pieces of electrical apparatus, the calorimotor and the deflagrator, which were marked improvements over any batteries then in use and which enabled him to work at very high temperatures. In addition he built an enclosed electric furnace which was promptly forgotten and was re-invented many years later. Although a brilliant experimenter Hare did not succeed in doing anything which was wanted then. It was Davy who isolated sodium and potassium and it was Faraday who worked out Faraday's law. Hare did brilliant work with his electric furnace, making calcium carbide, graphite, etc.; but people were not interested in such things then. Hare was in many respects the precursor of Moissan, though a much more brilliant man than the latter. Moissan was born at the right time, however, and will be known for a long time on account of his electric furnace work, because his efforts have been followed up. Hare was born too early and his work led to nothing. If we call Moissan the Christopher Columbus of the electric furnace, we must call Hare the Leif Eriksen of the same.

While Hare will never receive the credit to which he is entitled, chemists are grateful to Provost Smith for putting on record, in so readable a fashion, the facts in regard to this forgotten American pioneer.

WILDER D. BANCROFT.

To Mexico with Scott: Letters of Captain E. Kirby Smith to his Wife. Prepared for the press by his daughter Emma Jerome Blackwood, with an introduction by R. M. Johnston. (Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1917, pp. 225, \$1.25.) These letters from a fine officer of the regular army are a valuable addition to the first-hand literature of the Mexican War. The title is somewhat misleading, for one is almost half-way through the volume before Scott is overtaken, and the earlier part is not inferior in any way to the later. With the exception of the fighting at Monterey, which occurred while Captain Smith was absent on leave, all the striking incidents of Taylor's operations from the sojourn at Corpus Christi to the battle of Buena Vista are included, and we are given the only detailed account of Worth's unduly hurried march from Saltillo to "the Brazos". Under Scott the author fought at Vera

Cruz, but missed Cerro Gordo because of going on an expedition up Alvarado River, of which he gives the best account. His command was not at Contreras, but he distinguished himself at Churubusco; and at the next battle, Molino del Rey, he fell mortally wounded. Many subjects besides battles, however, are touched upon. One of the striking features of the letters is the writer's appreciation of beautiful scenery. On page 23 he speaks of the Nueces as "winding through the prairie like a blue ribbon carelessly thrown on a green robe", and many fine descriptive passages (*e. g.*, pp. 68, 74, 140, 210) remind us that professional soldiers are by no means mere fighters. Like other excellent officers the captain felt—and no doubt with justice—that honors did not always fall to the most deserved (p. 155), but was determined to do his duty in spite of that unpleasant fact. In his opinion of the volunteer forces also he concurred with other competent regulars, pronouncing them expensive, unruly, unreliable, though sometimes brave in battle, and too frequently a terror to the inhabitants—in all of which, minus a certain allowance for the regular army point of view, he was right. The reader of these, as of all other such documents, must ask himself here and there whether the writer was *in a position to know* the truth of what he believed and said, and by doing so will avoid accepting some errors. For example, it is stated (p. 132) that Santa Anna had his ministers with him at Cerro Gordo, and intended to negotiate, if beaten there. The author was not always able to give the correct spelling of Mexican names; some misprints can be found; and some accents are missing. *E. g.*, "Tamanlipas" is written for Tamaulipas (p. 22), "Tlacatalpin" for Tlacotalpam (p. 133), "Nopalucam" for Nopalucan (p. 160), "Mexicalingo" for Mexicaltzingo (p. 193) and "Peñon" for Peñón (p. 192). Professor R. M. Johnston contributes a handsome introduction.

JUSTIN H. SMITH.

Old Roads out of Philadelphia. By John T. Faris. (Philadelphia and London, J. B. Lippincott Company, 1917, pp. xix, 327, \$4.00.) This book aptly compares the old roads leading from Philadelphia to the wings of a fan stretching out into the country to south and west and north. The topography of the country renders this inevitable. In early days of settlement the most of the Quakers and Germans were farmers and such roads were needed to convey produce to the city for consumption and shipment.

Near these roads residences and inns naturally were placed and a large number of these buildings remain in a good state of preservation. Some old inns have been converted into spacious dwelling houses, architects skillfully harmonizing old and new. Around many have grown up traditions of history and of personal experience dating back to colonial or revolutionary times. Brandywine, Valley Forge, Germantown, and others have a national significance.

The old simple architecture has been largely preserved and has set the style for many modern residences. The farmers' houses of the district within twenty-five miles of Philadelphia, of from 100 to 200 years ago, have been reproduced with many expensive variations in the suburban residences of wealthy Philadelphians. There is thus both in old and new an atmosphere of the past along these roads which is easily noticeable. Often out of sight however, on side roads and in beautiful valleys, are old farmhouses which date back to 1700 or thereabouts. These have been improved by each generation by additions to buildings or planting which reveal the fact that these homesteads, coming down by will from father to son from the days of William Penn, have been the homes of a body of hereditary yeomen almost unknown elsewhere in the country. The Civil War and the years which followed broke up this succession in many cases, but the houses still remain.

So far as relates to the eleven roads and their surroundings, Mr. Faris has done his work well. The writer of this review has lived in part of this territory since his boyhood and can testify to the substantial accuracy and, in general, the judiciousness of the selection of material for his descriptions. There are some omissions which individuals locally interested may regret, but such will be reassured by the new matter drawn from wide sources of which they have probably not before heard.

The book is of interest to Philadelphia antiquarians and residents of the country described and the publishers have made a handsome volume.

ISAAC SHARPLESS.

The History of the Jews in Richmond from 1769 to 1917. By Herbert T. Ezekiel and Gaston Lichtenstein. (Richmond, Va., Herbert T. Ezekiel, 1917, pp. 374, \$3.00.) In its peculiar and narrowly limited field, this book is a work of very great excellence. Local histories, and especially local histories dealing with certain classes or races, are prone to jump at conclusions and to show little of the scientific historical spirit. From such a fault the history under consideration is refreshingly free. It is based on an examination of the Richmond city archives, most careful and exhaustive, on books, on newspapers, and on the statements of living witnesses of character and credibility. A book of the sort makes one feel that the lives of men are not so entirely writ in water, so evanescent, as they sometimes seem to be, for in the moderate compass of a single volume, the authors have presented the lives of all the Hebrews of any note at all who have been connected with Richmond. Jews have played a prominent part in the life of the city from its very inception; among the first business men who came to turn the insignificant village of Revolutionary times into the trading town of the nineteenth century were a number of Hebrews. Several of them rose to wealth and distinction. And since the early period, men of note like Sir Moses Montefiore and Sir Moses Ezekiel have lived and worked in

Richmond, not to mention the famous lawyer and statesman, Judah P. Benjamin, who, of course, directed the Confederate foreign policy from this city. And there are scores of other men and of women in the pages of the history who have left their mark on the community. The authors, imbued with a high ideal of historical accuracy, have left no labor unspared to make their work complete, and a good deal of matter which is of value in throwing light on general social and business conditions in Richmond has been included. One feature of interest is a list of Confederate soldiers of Hebrew blood who entered service from Richmond or who were connected with the city in after life. The part played by Jews in the military and civil concerns of Richmond all through the nineteenth century is given in great detail, as well as the history of the various synagogues, a matter of less interest to the general reader. Mr. Lichtenstein, who largely conducted the research, is a North Carolinian and the author of a number of good papers on the early history of his state. Mr. Ezekiel, the co-author, a newspaper man of experience, has put the book in a readable style which is to be highly commended. All in all, the work might serve as a model for this particular kind of history writing.

H. J. ECKENRODE.

Economic and Social History of Chowan County, North Carolina, 1880-1915. By W. Scott Boyce, Ph.D., Assistant Professor in Economics in the Connecticut College for Women. [Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, Columbia University, vol. LXXVI., no. 1.] (New York, Columbia University, 1917, pp. 293, \$2.50.) In this volume Dr. Boyce portrays the life and customs of Chowan County in 1880 and in 1915; sets forth "the main causes of the remarkable economic and social changes" which took place between those dates; and points out the "principal factors" which so long delayed the economic development of a region of such "enormous possibilities". He treats his subject under four general heads: (I.) Elements of Economic and Social Life; (II.) Development of Economic Life; (III.) Development of Social Life; (IV.) Conclusions; to which he appends twenty-four statistical tables. The various phases of the subject—agriculture, fishing, manufacturing, lumbering, communication and transportation, labor and wages, education, sanitation and hygiene, religion, social customs—are all discussed with the intimate knowledge derived from personal association and close observation. The author is at his best in describing social customs, though at times multiplicity of details obscures the picture; perhaps, however, this is unavoidable. His statements of facts are generally accurate, but it is doubtful, to say the least, whether there can be found in Chowan County any woman who thinks that "any useful work whatsoever ill befits a lady" (pp. 153, 256); whether "Drinking in those days [1880] was a mark of gentility" (p. 197). Nor are the author's conclusions always convincing. The lack of ready capital,

for instance, certainly played a larger part in the economic conditions of Chowan County in 1880, than the author seems disposed to concede; the conclusion that the "time-system", which he so justly condemns, is "the child of slavery" (pp. 251-252) is certainly open to discussion. Again, the conclusion that negro women are withdrawing from domestic service because they have "absolutely no protection from being grossly insulted" by white men, that "the more educated and refined she [the negro woman] is, the greater the efforts made by white men to seduce her" (pp. 153-154), is so far from being justified by the facts that one can scarcely exercise proper self-restraint in referring to it. Improved economic conditions, which enable negro men to support their wives and daughters, who are thus able to devote themselves to their own families and domestic affairs, and these alone, are responsible for the withdrawal of negro women from the domestic service of white families.

In spite, however, of these and a few minor faults, such as occasional flippancy in treatment and the use of slang expressions (*e. g.*, "local sheet" for local newspaper, p. 187; "an eighteen-year-old" for a blushing bride, p. 189), Dr. Boyce has produced an interesting and illuminating work, characterized by painstaking care in the collection of data and, generally, sympathetic understanding in interpretation.

R. D. W. CONNOR.

Applied History. Edited by Benjamin F. Shambaugh. Volume III. *Statute Law-Making in Iowa.* (Iowa City, State Historical Society of Iowa, 1916, pp. xviii, 718, \$3.00.) This is a co-operative work, composed of the following monographs: History and Organization of the Legislature in Iowa, by John E. Briggs; Law-making Powers of the Legislature in Iowa, by Benjamin F. Shambaugh; Methods of Statute Law-making in Iowa, by O. K. Patton; Form and Language of Statutes in Iowa, by Jacob Van der Zee; Codification of Statute Law in Iowa, by Dan E. Clark; Interpretation and Construction of Statutes in Iowa, by O. K. Patton; the Drafting of Statutes, by Jacob Van der Zee; the Committee System, by Frank E. Horack; and Some Abuses connected with Statute Law-making, by Ivan L. Pollock.

The book constitutes a complete review of legislative organization and operation in Iowa, and is the first comprehensive study of a state legislature, although too little attention is given to the governor's share in legislation. The monographs maintain a high standard of excellence, although one feels that some of them have been written rather from printed records than from first-hand observation of legislative activities. The first monograph in the volume, that devoted to the history and organization of the legislature, contains much useful information but reads in places more like a catalogue than a treatise.

Dr. Van der Zee's study of the form and language of statutes in Iowa is especially well done, and gives useful illustrations of practices common to all state legislatures. To the reviewer Dr. Horack's study of the committee system is also of distinct interest.

A study such as that in the volume under review has the merit of giving the facts in detail upon a specific problem, but it has the disadvantage of viewing the local situation with too little reference to similar problems presenting themselves elsewhere. A broader view, for example, would probably have led to a less hostile view of sub-committees (p. 564). An erroneous statement is made regarding the extent of the powers of state governors to veto items in appropriation bills (p. 652). One to some extent familiar with Illinois legislative developments in recent years may perhaps be permitted to question the statement that legislative blackmail is prevalent in Illinois (p. 651).

A History of the North Indiana Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church from its Organization in 1844 to the Present. By Rev. H. N. Herrick, D.D., and William Warren Sweet, Professor of History in DePauw University. (Indianapolis, W. K. Stewart Company, 1917, pp. 363, xii, \$2.50.) This work was projected by the Rev. Horace N. Herrick of North Indiana Conference in 1910. He was able to give five years to collecting material, which he did with marvellous industry and intelligence. Dr. Herrick died in 1915, whereupon the work of digesting this material and of preparing it for publication was committed to Professor William W. Sweet, of DePauw University, a practical writer of history with special knowledge of Methodist matters. The outcome is a worthy memorial of a great religious movement; and a significant contribution to the social history of a sovereign state. There were Methodist itinerants in what is now the state of Indiana as early as 1801. The first organized pastoral charge, however, dates from 1807. It is estimated that the entire Methodist following at that time, so far as membership lists made record, did not exceed twenty souls. What there was of supervision for the small and scattered Methodism in Indiana was given by the stronger organizations in Kentucky and Illinois.

The growth of the church was rapid. In 1832 the membership is reported at 20,000 and Indiana Conference was organized. In 1844 this conference, with a membership of 67,000, was divided into the Indiana Conference and North Indiana Conference, the latter beginning its history with a membership of 28,000. In 1916 this last named single conference reported a membership of 88,000, while the total Methodist membership in the state is reported at 262,000. Moreover, the religious movement was supplemented by educational and philanthropic enterprises which have served to extend the influence of the denomination far beyond denominational lines; DePauw University, for instance, which now has over seven hundred students and over one million dollars worth of property; and the Methodist Hospital of Indianapolis, which receives patients regardless of denominational affiliation.

Professor Sweet shows in a most convincing way the intimate bearings of religion upon social movements, notably those dealing with the abolition of the slave-trade and of the liquor traffic. He notes also the

influence of the "Gas Boom" of 1888, which in its earlier stages promoted a hectic prosperity and, in its later stages, a deep depression alike of religious and of all other enterprise. There are interesting and instructive passages dealing with the attitude of the church towards amusements and church music. It seems inconceivable to us in this day that an otherwise progressive and cultivated church should object to the use of the organ in public worship, but in the earlier day even so eminent an apostle as Peter Cartwright bitterly opposed what he termed "high-toned" music. As late as 1870, when the annual conference was in session at Kokomo, the anti-organ agitators filled the organ with pepper which set the choir and congregation to sneezing and coughing as soon as the organ was started. Not the least useful function of this interesting and comprehensive study is the light it sheds upon the manners, customs, prejudices, and enthusiasms of our immediate forebears.

CHARLES M. STUART.

Reminiscences. By William Fletcher King. (New York and Cincinnati, the Abingdon Press, 1915, pp. 716, \$2.50.) This bulky volume of reminiscences is by the president emeritus of Cornell College, Mount Vernon, Iowa. He became a teacher in this college in 1862, and continued in active service until 1908, serving from 1865 as its president. His career as a college president thus covered a period of forty-three years, one of the longest on record. At the ripe age of eighty-two he set about writing his reminiscences, urged by his friends to the task. The book follows the simple chronological order, starting with Ancestors and Childhood, and ending with a Cruise around the World. There are thirty-four chapters in all.

Naturally the casual reader would hardly be interested in a number of the more personal chapters, but to the graduate of Cornell College, or to an acquaintance of the author it would prove a fascinating book. There are, however, several chapters which deserve to be classed as historical material. The author was born in a frontier community in Ohio, and his description of the neighborhood in which he spent his boyhood and youth are both interesting and instructive. Most of the original settlers were still living, during his boyhood, and he had thus the opportunity of hearing at first hand the tales of the hardships and adventures attending the settlement of a frontier community. He gives considerable space to the country school, which he attended, and to the text-books used, as well as to a description of the country church, and the part it played in the social life of the community.

The author spent the year 1853-1854 in the South, teaching in an academy in Tennessee, where he had an opportunity of observing the operation of the institution of slavery. Among his experiences while in the South was attendance upon a slave auction. Another opportunity of considerable interest, which came to him, was that of accompanying

Sherman's army in its march from Savannah northward through the Carolinas. The occasion of this visit to Sherman's army was to collect money from the Iowa troops toward a fund that was being provided by Cornell College to assist in the education of returned soldiers and their children. This scheme was approved by the officials of the state of Iowa, and the appeal met a hearty response from the Iowa troops, who subscribed nearly thirty thousand dollars toward the fund.

Among the other varied experiences of the author of this volume is the getting together of a fortune of some two hundred thousand dollars, largely through fortunate real-estate investments, which he has in recent years turned over, to the last penny, to the college to which he has devoted his long life.

W. W. SWEET.

El General Sucre. Por Carlos Pereyra. [Biblioteca de la Juventud Hispano-Americana.] (Madrid, Sociedad General Española de Librería [1917], pp. 303, 3.50 pesetas.) The text of this volume, the fourth in a series by the same author, is designed to tell the story of the life and times of Antonio José de Sucre to the youth of Hispanic America. The narrative is not so much an actual biography of that patriot as a collection of episodic sketches in which he appears less frequently than might be expected. In its preparation the author has used for the most part the standard lives of Sucre and some of the contemporary memoirs. Had he availed himself of the correspondence gathered by O'Leary, and centred attention upon the man himself, instead of upon his historical environment, a more intimate personal picture of Bolívar's great lieutenant would have been the outcome. Two of the appendixes, also, are rather irrelevant.

HISTORICAL NEWS

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The thirty-third annual meeting of the Association was held in Philadelphia on December 27-29. The presidential address of Mr. Worthington C. Ford is printed in this number of this journal. The next number will contain the usual article descriptive of the proceedings. The meeting is especially marked by the retirement of Dr. Clarence W. Bowen from the office of treasurer, which he has filled with signal devotion and success from the first day of the Association's existence till the present time, a space of thirty-three and a third years. Such a period of service is almost without example in such organizations. Its completion should be signalized by the expression of cordial gratitude on the part of all who have had the interests of the Association at heart.

The usual Thanksgiving meeting of the Executive Council was held in New York on December 1. The Council voted to recommend to the Association that the publication of the prize essays in separate form be discontinued commencing with the essay to receive the Justin Winsor prize in 1918. The Council also voted to recommend that the rules governing the competition be so amended as to admit printed monographs as well as monographs in manuscript. A full statement of the action taken by the Association at its annual meeting on December 29 will be printed in the April number of this *Review* or may be secured upon application to the secretary of the Association.

A prize of \$250 is offered for the best approved essay on a subject in military history. The fields of study are not limited, but the Civil War is recommended as specially suitable. While the committee expects that the essays submitted will range from about 20,000 to 50,000 words, this is not intended as an absolute condition. Essays may be submitted in print or in manuscript, but in the latter case they must be typewritten. All essays must be sent to the chairman of the committee, Professor R. M. Johnston, 275 Widener Hall, Cambridge, Massachusetts, not later than August 31, 1918.

Proof-reading upon volume II. of the *Annual Report* for 1914, being the General Index to the Association's *Papers* and *Annual Reports* for its first thirty years, is approaching completion, and the volume (of about 825 pages) is expected to issue from the Government Printing Office before the end of the year. The *Annual Report* for 1915 is likely to come out before the end of the next three months. The two volumes of the *Annual Report* for 1916, the second consisting of the Correspondence

of R. M. T. Hunter, edited by Professor Charles H. Ambler, were sent to the Government Printing Office some time ago, but owing to the great congestion of work in that establishment the date of its publication is very uncertain.

At the moment of going to press, the receipts of dues for membership in the Association, in response to the bills sent out by the treasurer at the beginning of the fiscal year in September, have been much less than the receipts at corresponding dates in previous years. Members are most earnestly requested, not only to make prompt payment of these dues, but to exert themselves to secure additional members and thus to extend the resources and usefulness of the Association.

NATIONAL BOARD FOR HISTORICAL SERVICE

Owing to the return of Professor Shotwell from Washington to New York, and of Professor Hull to Ithaca, the National Board for Historical Service has been reorganized, Professor Evarts B. Greene having been made chairman and Professor Dana C. Munro vice-chairman. An executive committee, and standing committees on research, on educational matters, on bibliography and records, and on co-operation, have been instituted. Plans have been prepared for systematic lecturing on the historical background and origins of the war, to the young men in the great training camps and cantonments, under the auspices of the War Department Commission for Training Camp Activities.

A careful syllabus for lectures or teaching respecting the origins and history of the present war, prepared by Professor Samuel B. Harding of the Indiana State University, under the auspices of the Board, will be published shortly as one of a series of supplements, with which the editor of the *History Teacher's Magazine* intends to accompany successive numbers of that journal.

Two additional states having, at somewhat late dates, made arrangements for prizes for historical essays on the question "Why the United States is at War", in competitions similar to those described in our last number (p. 228), and the date for the conclusion of these two competitions having been set at March 1, it has become necessary to postpone by two months any action in the way of national competition between the essays successful in the various state contests.

PERSONAL

E. Benjamin Andrews, formerly president of Brown University, superintendent of the schools of Chicago, and chancellor of the University of Nebraska, died on October 30, at the age of seventy-three. Chiefly known in recent years as an able, broadminded, and far-seeing executive, he had in earlier years, when professor in Brown University,

produced historical manuals of original quality, *Institutes of Constitutional History, English and American* (1884), and *Institutes of General History* (1885). His *History of the United States* (1894) and his *History of the Last Quarter-Century in the United States* (1896), subsequently enlarged into his *History of the United States in our Own Times* (1903), were books intended for a more popular audience; while showing some evidences of haste in composition, they bore nevertheless the impress of a powerful mind, treated a difficult period with candor and fairness, and conveyed to the reader's mind the author's vivid sense of force and movement in the development of American society.

Brig.-Gen. Hiram M. Chittenden, U. S. A., died on October 9 at the age of fifty-nine. Graduated from the United States Military Academy in 1884, and retiring from the army as a brigadier-general in 1910, he had spent his professional life mostly in government engineering works in the Far West. Important historical works, marked by much research and extensive and accurate information, arose out of these interests: *The American Fur-Trade of the Far West* (1901), and the *History of Early Steamboat Navigation on the Mississippi River* (1903).

Dr. George Willis Botsford, professor of ancient history in Columbia University and in the field of Greek and Roman history one of the most distinguished and valued students that America has produced, died on December 14, at the age of fifty-five. He had published several historical treatises of importance, *The Development of the Athenian Constitution* (1893), *The Roman Assemblies* (1900), and the collection entitled *Hellenic Civilization* (1915), and also important text-books of ancient history, of Greek history, and of Roman history.

Dr. Margaret S. Morriss, associate professor of history in Mt. Holyoke College, has resigned her position to go to France as secretary of the Young Women's Christian Association.

Dr. James M. Leake, formerly of Bryn Mawr College, has been appointed professor of history in Allegheny College, Meadville, Pennsylvania.

Dr. Solon J. Buck, of the University of Minnesota, has been advanced from the grade of assistant professor of history to that of associate professor.

Professor Charles H. Ambler of Randolph-Macon College has accepted a call to a new chair of history in the University of West Virginia. Mr. C. D. Johns, associate professor of history in Richmond College, has been elected as Mr. Ambler's successor in Randolph-Macon.

Professor Thomas M. Marshall of the University of Idaho has been called to the University of Colorado as assistant professor of American history.

GENERAL

In the September number of the *History Teacher's Magazine* Professor E. B. Greene offers some useful Suggestions on the Relation of American to European History. The October number includes an article by Professor W. Westergaard on American Interest in the West Indies, one by Professor E. M. Violette on the Renaissance in Military History, and one by Harriet E. Tuell entitled the Study of the Nations: an Experiment. There are also a number of Suggestions for Secondary School History, including those of the committee on European history concerning Ethnographical Conditions in Central Europe, and those of Professor St. George L. Sioussat concerning English Foundations of American Institutional Life. Similar suggestions are found also in the November and December numbers. In the former Professor E. B. Greene discusses the American Revolution and the British Empire, and Professor R. J. Kerner the Historic Rôle of the Slavs. In the latter Professor Wallace Notestein discusses the Interest of Seventeenth-Century England for Students of American Institutions, and Dr. James Sullivan Some Aspects of American Experience, 1775-1783. Among the larger articles in the December number are Democracy and War, by Professor J. G. Randall, the Holy Alliance, its Origins and Influence, by Professor W. S. Robertson, and the Importance of the Agricultural Revolution, by Professor Raymond G. Taylor. Many of these articles have been prepared in co-operation with the educational committee of the National Board for Historical Service, in an endeavor to relate the four historical curricula of the high schools, at successive monthly stages, to the various aspects and phenomena of the Great War and to the public interests of the present day.

The October number of the *Military Historian and Economist* has for its historical contents part I. of an article on Man and Nature at Port Hudson, 1863-1917, by Professor Milledge L. Bonham, jr., of Louisiana.

In the *Journal of Negro History* for October, John R. Lynch criticizes various statements made by Dr. Rhodes respecting the Negro in the Reconstruction Period, Charles H. Wesley gives a good account of the Struggle for the Recognition of Haiti and Liberia as Independent Republics, and Father Joseph Butsch, of St. Joseph's Seminary in Baltimore, treats of Catholics and the Negro. Among the documents presented are letters of Washington bearing on the negro, a petition for compensation for the loss of slaves in the Danish West Indies, 1851, and the speech of a Mobile negro at a reconstruction meeting in 1867.

The fourth volume of Benedetto Croce's *Filosofia dello Spirito* (Bari, Laterza, 1917, pp. viii, 300) deals with the theory and history of historiography.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXIII.--29.

The Oxford University Press announces a collection of essays entitled *Studies in the History and Method of Science*. Among the contributors are the editor, Mr. Charles Singer, J. W. Jenkinson, killed in the Dardanelles, and F. S. Schiller.

The Yale University Press has announced *The Growth of Medicine from the Earliest Times to c. 1880* by A. H. Buck.

Among those to whom Dr. Cabanès pays his medico-historical respects in the fourth volume of his *Légendes et Curiosités de l'Histoire* (Paris, Michel, 1917) are Pascal, Madame de Sevigné, Rousseau, Diderot, and the Duc du Maine.

Mr. Gerard Fiennes's *Sea Power and Freedom* is an historical survey of the subject, endeavoring to establish the thesis that the possession of sea power on the part of a nation is necessarily antagonistic to despotic rule.

Among the recent announcements of the Oxford University Press are, *A History of South Africa*, by Dorothea Fairbridge; *A History of Ancient Coinage, 700-300 B. C.*, by Professor Percy Gardner; *The Descent of Manuscripts*, by Dr. A. C. Clark; and *Warren Hastings's Administration of Bengal*, by M. E. Monckton Jones.

The Texas History Teachers' *Bulletin*, volume VI., no. 1, contains, as "source readings", two epistles of Innocent III., and a group of letters of 1821 and 1822 to Stephen F. Austin, from prospective settlers on his grant.

ANCIENT HISTORY

In the *Yale Oriental Series* Mr. Henry F. Lutz has recently published *Early Babylonian Letters from Larsa* (Yale University Press).

The Princeton University Press, which some time ago issued the second volume of *Early Egyptian Records of Travel*, containing texts of the Eighteenth Dynasty edited by Mr. David Paton, is to issue shortly *Egyptian Records of Travel in Western Asia*, prepared by the same editor.

A successful attempt to popularize the results of the latest archaeological research is found in *Myths of Crete and Pre-Hellenic Europe* by Donald A. Mackenzie (Gresham Publishing Company).

Dr. L. Laurand treats the topics history, geography, and institutions of Rome in the fourth part of his *Manuel des Études Grecques et Latines* (Paris, Picard), which has been issued recently. Latin literature and historical Latin grammar will be dealt with in the fifth and sixth parts, which are announced as ready for early distribution.

Supplementary and miscellaneous inscriptions to the number of over two hundred are included in the second section of the fourth part of

The Collection of Ancient Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum (Oxford, University Press, 1916, pp. 107-301). This section is edited by F. H. Marshall and contains, among other interesting items, the Greek text of the Rosetta stone. This completes the publication of the Greek inscriptions in the British Museum which was begun in 1874 and had been interrupted since 1893.

Volume XIII. of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, edited by Dr. B. P. Grenfell, contains a literary miscellany, among which are a fragment from Pindar, portions of orations by Lysias, a symposium on Hellenic history and mythology, and part of the history by Ephorus. The volume has been in the hands of the printer for some time and will probably be completed shortly.

Miss Emily L. Shields has presented as her doctoral dissertation a thoroughgoing study of Lesbian gods, entitled *The Cults of Lesbos* (Menasha, Wis., George Banta Publishing Company).

The inscriptions published by Dr. P. Roussel in *Les Cultes Égyptiens à Delos du 3^e au 1^{er} Siècle avant J. C.* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1917, pp. 300) furnishes much new information on the diffusion of Egyptian cults in the Greek world. The work forms the twenty-ninth and thirtieth volumes of the *Annales de l'Est*.

Henri Gautier devotes the fifth volume of *Le Livre des Rois d'Égypte* to the Roman emperors. The volume appears in the *Mémoires publiés par les Membres de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale du Caire* (Cairo, the Institute, 1917).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: F. Cumont, *La Langue des Hittites* (Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, March); A. E. R. Boak, *The Present Status of the Problem of Races in the Pre-Historic Aegean Basin* (Classical Journal, October); Seymour de Ricci, *Le Table de Palerme* (Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, March); J. B. Willson, *Lead and Tin in Ancient Times* (Princeton Theological Review, July); V. Costanzi, *La Condizione Giuridica della Grecia dopo la Distruzione di Corinto nel 146 a. Ch.* (Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica, July).

EARLY CHURCH HISTORY

Recent volumes in the series, *Les Saints* (Paris, Gabalda, 1917) are *Sainte Paule, 347-404*, by R. Génier, and *Saint Nicholas, Évêque de Myre, vers 270-341*, by Abbé Marin.

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

Professor Charles Diehl has recently issued a volume entitled *Dans l'Orient Byzantin* (Paris, Boccard, 1917, pp. viii, 331), in the *Collection d'Étude d'Histoire et d'Archéologie*.

The third volume of J. Koulakovsky's *Istoriia Vizantii* (Kiev, Koulijenko, 1915, pp. xiv, 431, reviewed by L. Bréhier, *Journal des Savants*, September) deals with the period of Byzantine history from 602 to 717, the age of the dynasty of Heraclius.

Documents for the third year of the pontificate, 1256-1257, are published in the second volume of *Les Registres d'Alexandre IV.: Recueil des Bulles de ce Pape, publiées ou analysées d'après les Manuscrits Originiaux des Archives du Vatican* (Paris, Boccard, 1917, pp. 489-752), edited by J. de Loye and P. de Cenival.

The third volume of the *Harvard Studies in Romance Languages* contains four essays by the late Professor Murray A. Potter, prepared for publication by his colleagues. Three of the essays deal with Petrarch, as author, as man, and as critic and reader. The fourth is an entertaining essay on the Horse as an Epic Character.

G. Mollat is bringing out a new annotated edition of the *Vitae Paparum Avenionensium* (Paris, Letouzey, 1917, 4 vols.) of Étienne Baluze, and has published a volume of *Études Critiques sur les Vitae Paparum Avenionensium d'Étienne Baluze* (*ibid.*).

Messrs. G. P. Putnam's Sons have published *The Life and Works of Wessel Gansfort*, by Edward W. Miller and Jared W. Scudder. The work presents a biography of Gansfort with an estimate of his importance as a forerunner of Luther and a translation of his Letters, his Treatise on the Eucharist, and Farrago.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: R. L. Poole, *The Names and Numbers of Medieval Popes* (*English Historical Review*, October); A. Fliche, *L'Élection d'Urbain II.* (*Le Moyen Age*, July, 1916); J. B. Chabot, *Un Épisode Inédit de l'Histoire des Croisades: le Siège de Birta, 1145* (*Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, March); L. Bréhier, *Origin of the Misunderstanding between the Roman Church and the East* (*Constructive Quarterly*, September); Rose G. Kingsley, *The Order of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem* (*Edinburgh Review*, October); *Magister Gregorius de Mirabilibus Urbis Romae* (*English Historical Review*, October).

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

General review: E. Chapuisat, *Les Études Napoléoniennes en Suisse, 1916* (*Revue des Études Napoléoniennes*, September).

An interesting study in the development of internationalism is *Der Gedanke der Internationalen Organisation in seiner Entwicklung, 1300-1800* (the Hague, Nijhoff, 1917, pp. xi, 397), by Dr. Jacob Ter Meulen.

The Life of St. Francis Xavier: Evangelist, Explorer, Mystic, by Edith Anne Stewart, published by Messrs. Headley, while a popular

account, is based in large part on the letters of Xavier issued by the Society of Jesus in Madrid, translations from some of which are included.

Professor P. Sagnac of the University of Lille has written *Le Rhin Français pendant la Révolution et l'Empire* (Paris, Alcan, 1917) for the *Bibliothèque d'Histoire Contemporaine*.

Un Diplomate d'il y a Cent Ans: Frédéric de Gentz, 1764-1832 (Paris, Payot, 1917, pp. 308) is by A. Robinet de Cléry.

Messrs. Macmillan announce F. J. C. Hearnshaw's *Main Currents of European History, 1815-1915*.

Commandant M. H. Weil, shortly before the outbreak of war, was permitted to work in the Vienna archives, especially among the police reports, and has now published his findings in two volumes on *Les Dessous du Congrès de Vienne d'après les Documents Originaux des Archives du Ministère Impérial et Royal de l'Intérieur à Vienne* (Paris, Payot, 1917, pp. xxiv, 872; iv, 784).

A study of *La Révolution de Juillet 1830 et l'Europe* (Paris, Émile-Paul, 1917, pp. viii, 564) is by the Vicomte de Guichen.

E. Babelon has published the second volume which completes his *La Grande Question d'Occident: le Rhin dans l'Histoire* (Paris, Leroux, 1917).

Under the title *The Willy-Nicky Telegrams*, Alfred A. Knopf of New York has recently published a translation by Herman Bernstein of an intimate private correspondence between the emperors of Germany and Russia.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: B. Feliciangeli, *Le Proposte per la Guerra contro i Turchi presentate da Stefano Taleazzi, Vescovo di Torcello, a Papa Alessandro VI.* (Archivio della R. Società Romana di Storia Patria, XL. 1); N. Weiss, *L'Origine et les Étapes Historiques des Droits de l'Homme et des Peuples* (Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du Protestantisme Français, April); A. F. Steuart, *Early Russian Embassies to Britain* (Twentieth Century Russia, July); G. Drei, *La Politica di Pio IV. e del Cardinale Ercole Gonzaga, 1559-1560* (Archivio della R. Società Romana di Storia Patria, XL. 1); Hamilton Vreeland, jr., *Hugo Grotius, Diplomatist* (American Journal of International Law, July); F. W. Baumgartner, *The Neutralization of States* [cont.] (Queen's Quarterly, October, November, December); Sir John Macdonell, *The True Freedom of the Sea* (Nineteenth Century, November); W. A. Phillips, *The Balance of Power* (The New Europe, November 1); G. Vauthier, *Lakanal Commissaire de la République dans les Quatre Nouveaux Départements de la Rive Gauche du Rhin* (Annales Révolutionnaires, July); O. Karmin, *Autour des Négociations Financières*

Anglo-Prusso-Russes de 1813, I. (Revue Historique de la Révolution et de l'Empire, April); Col. A. Grouard, *Les Derniers Historiens de 1815: la Journée du 17 Juin 1815: Note Additionnelle, à propos de la "Réponse" de M. E. Lenient* (Revue des Études Napoléoniennes, September); J. Rovère, *La Rive Gauche du Rhin*, I., *La Résistance à la Conquête, 1815-1848* (Revue des Deux Mondes, October 1); Sir Francis Piggott, *The Story of the Declaration of Paris* (Nineteenth Century, November); J. Reinach, *Gambetta et Bismarck; l'Affaire Schnaebelé* (Revue de Paris, August 15).

THE GREAT WAR

The little weekly periodical, *The New Europe*, which has been appearing in London during the war, was recently described by a competent American authority as "worth more to one interested in European diplomacy than everything else together".

The library of the city of Lyons has issued four parts (40 pp. each) of a *Catalogue du Fonds de la Guerre: Contribution à une Bibliographie Générale de la Guerre de 1914* (Paris, Éditions et Librairie, 1917). It is reported that the library of the University of Bologna has made special effort to collect publications on the war and is engaged in the preparation of a catalogue of its collection. The Italian government has established an Historiographical Office on Mobilization to gather materials on the Italian part in the war. The publisher Barbèra has issued a *Bibliografia della Preparazione* (1916), and is now engaged on a *Bibliografia della Partecipazione*. These two works cover the war in general. The *Argus de la Presse* has published *Grand Guerre, 1914-15-16-17, Nomenclature des Journaux, Revues, Périodiques Français paraissant en France et en Langue Française à l'Étranger* (Paris, Argus, 1917, pp. 271).

President Nicholas Murray Butler has published *A World in Ferment: Interpretations of the War for a New World* (New York, Scribner, 1917, pp. viii, 254). Somewhat similar interpretative studies will be found in Professor Gilbert Murray's *Faith, War, and Policy: Addresses and Essays on the European War* (Boston, Houghton, 1917, pp. xiv, 255); in René Lote's *Les Leçons Intellectuelles de la Guerre* (Paris, Perrin, 1917); and in Christopher Nyrop's *Guerre et Civilisation* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1917), which is translated from the Danish by E. Philipot.

Topography and Strategy in War (Holt), by Dr. Douglas W. Johnson, associate professor of physiography in Columbia University, is intended to show by text, map, and photographs, how the lay of the land affects the fortunes of war, to study from this point of view the chief theatres of the present war, and to summarize its campaigns.

International relations antecedent to the war have furnished subjects for the following interesting studies which have recently appeared: A.

Soulange-Bodin, *L'Avant-Guerre Allemande en Europe* (Paris, Perrin, 1917), which deals especially with the commercial rivalry with England; G. Brunel, *Les Incidents Franco-Allemands de 1871 à 1914* (Paris, Pigeon, 1917), which relates to the Schnaebelé affair, the various Moroccan episodes, and the formation of the Franco-Russian alliance; E. Laloy, *La Diplomatie de Guillaume II. depuis son Avènement jusqu'à la Déclaration de Guerre de l'Angleterre* (Paris, Bossard, 1917, pp. 420); J. Carrère, *L'Impérialisme Britannique et le Rapprochement Franco-Anglais, 1900-1903* (Paris, Perrin, 1917, pp. xiv, 352); and A. Gauvain, *L'Europe au Jour le Jour* (vol. I., *La Crise Bosniaque, 1908-1909*, Paris, Bossard, 1917, pp. 500).

In the three parts of *Les Études de la Guerre* (Paris, Payot, 1917) which have so far been published by René Puaux will be found some new materials and some new considerations relating to the diplomatic history of the outbreak of the war.

Charles Benoist has reprinted from the *Revue des Deux Mondes* his fortnightly comments on the war situation during the first half of 1916 under the title *L'Europe en Feu: Chroniques de la Grande Guerre* (Paris, Perrin, 1917). *La Société des Nations* (Paris, Grasset, 1917), by Edgard Milhaud, is mainly compiled from his articles of current comment in *L'Humanité*.

General Palat (Pierre Lehautcourt) has published the first volume of *La Grande Guerre sur le Front Occidental* (Paris, Chapelot, 1917), which is devoted to a consideration of the elements involved and the preliminaries of the problem. The second volume of General Malleterre's *Études et Impressions de Guerre* (Paris, Tallandier, 1917) relates to the second year of the war. The volume on the *Troisième Année de Guerre, Août 1916-Août 1917* (Paris, Édition Française Illustrée, 1917, pp. 900, 2800 illustrations) has appeared in the series *J'ai Vu. Los Imperios Centrales contra los Aliados* (Paris, Imp. Artistique Lux, 1916, pp. viii, 400), by J. Muñoz Escamez, is a comprehensive account of the first year and a half of the war.

Les Batailles de la Marne (September 6-12), by an "Officier d'État-Major Allemand", published in Germany in January, 1916, was in April, 1916, withdrawn from publication and all available copies were bought up. The volume is now to be obtained only in the French translation, by an official of the Belgian war department, to which M. Joseph Reinach has prefixed an excellent preface (Paris, Van Oest, 1917, pp. 160). The volume contains maps reproduced from the German volume. A series of *Guides Michelin pour la Visite des Champs de Bataille* (Paris, Berger-Levrault) is being published. Three volumes have appeared dealing with the Marne battle-fields. The volumes seem to be done with great care and thoroughness and are supplied with maps and an abundance of illustrations. English editions will also be published.

With a Reservist in France: a Personal Account of all the Engagements in which the First Division, First Corps, took Part (New York, Dutton, 1917, pp. 156) is by F. A. Bolwell and relates experiences at the Marne, the first battle of Ypres, Neuve Chapelle, Festubert, and Loos.

In the series *Mémoires et Récits de Guerre* (Paris, Hachette) the latest volumes issued are *Lettres de Guerre, Août 1914-Avril 1915*, by P. M. Masson; *De l'Alsace à la Somme: Souvenirs du Front, Août 1914-Janvier 1917*, by Commandant Bréant; *Mon Groupe d'Autos-Canons: Souvenirs de Campagne d'un Officier de Marine, Septembre 1914-Avril 1916*, by P. de Kadoré; and *Notre Camarade Tommy, Offensives Anglaises de Janvier à Juin 1917*, by H. Ruffin and A. Tudesq. In the series *Les Récits des Témoins* (Paris, Berger-Levrault) there have recently appeared *Journal d'un Officier de Cavalerie*, by C. Ouy-Vernazabres, relating to the opening events of the war; and *La Flamme Victorieuse, Carnet de Route, Trois Étapes du 20^e Corps, Haraucourt, Fouquescourt, Hébuterne*, by R. Gentil.

Messrs. Perrin of Paris have published the memoirs of E. F. Julia, *La Fatalité de la Guerre, Scènes et Propos du Front*; of G. Boucheron, *L'Assaut, l'Argonne et Vanquois avec la 10^e Division, 1914-1915*; and of V. Lebedev, *Souvenirs d'un Volontaire Russe dans l'Armée Française, 1914-1915*, translated by P. F. Trogan and I. de Wyzewa. Max Deauville has written *Jusqu'à l'Yser* (Paris, Calmann-Lévy, 1917, pp. ii, 394) from the notes of Dr. M. Duwez of the Belgian army. Early episodes of the war are also chronicled in *De Verdun à Mannheim: Souvenirs de Captivité* (Paris, Vitet, 1917), by J. Simonin, and in *Impressions d'un Simple, 1913-1916* (Paris, Colin, 1917, pp. xii, 284), by J. Maurie. R. Milan has published a second volume of *Les Vagabonds de la Gloire* (Paris, Plon, 1917) dealing with the Saloniki and Italian campaigns and naval aviation.

Notable among war books for its high literary quality is *Campaigns and Intervals* (Houghton, Mifflin), a translation of the war journal of Lieutenant Jean Giraudoux.

Henry C. Mahoney, who entered Germany on his way to Russia in July, 1914, recounts his experiences in *Sixteen Months in Four German Prisons* (Robert M. McBride Company). G. Desson's narrative of imprisonment, translated under the title *A Hostage in Germany*, has been published by Messrs. Dutton, who also publish *In German Hands*, by Charles Hennebois. Professor D. J. McCarthy of the University of Pennsylvania, who as a representative of the American embassy in Berlin investigated prison conditions, writes of what he learned in *The Prisoner of War in Germany* (Moffat, Yard).

The comparative question of the treatment of prisoners of war, in France and in Germany, has received the best treatment known to us in

Le Régime des Prisonniers de Guerre en France et en Allemagne au Regard des Conventions Internationales, 1914-1916 (Paris, Imprimerie Nationale, 1916, pp. 100, and many photographs and facsimiles), published with a valuable preface by M. Louis Renault, the well-known publicist who had so large a part in the adjustment of questions in this field at the Hague Conferences.

The Journal of Submarine Commander von Forstner, translated by Mrs. Russell Codman, with an introduction by John Hays Hammond, is a frank account of methods of German U-boat warfare (Houghton Mifflin Company).

The able authority on Slavic questions, Professor Louis Leger of the Collège de France, is the author of a volume on *Le Panславisme et l'Intérêt Français* (Paris, Flammarion, 1917).

Les Deux Suisses, 1914-1917 (Paris, Bossard, 1917), by Louis Dumur, is a denunciatory description of German influence and activities in Switzerland.

From the southeastern theatre we have M. Dunan, *L'Été Bulgare, Notes d'un Témoin, Juillet-Octobre, 1915* (Paris, Chapelot, 1917, pp. viii, 396); H. Libermann, *Face aux Bulgares, la Campagne Française en Macédoine Serbe: Récits vécus d'un Officier de Chasseurs à Pied, Octobre, 1915-Janvier, 1916* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1917, pp. ix, 392); and Auguste Boppe, the French minister to Serbia, *À la Suite du Gouvernement Serbe, de Nich à Corfou, 20 Octobre 1915-19 Janvier 1916* (Paris, Bossard, 1917, pp. 160).

La Campagne Anglo-Belge de l'Afrique-Orientale Allemande (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1917), by Charles Stiénon, is based on official materials and has a preface by the Belgian premier, Baron de Broqueville. This campaign is the only colonial one in the present war which has involved prolonged and serious fighting, and this is the first attempt to give a systematic and comprehensive account of it.

Brig.-Gen. J. H. V. Crowe, C. B., who accompanied General Smuts in his East African campaign, has written an account of it, interesting to students of military history, entitled *General Smuts' Campaign in East Africa*. On the other hand, *Marching on Tanga* (London, Collins), by Francis Brett Young, a medical officer under Smuts, is devoted chiefly to the difficulties offered by the country rather than to military details.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: A. Chéradame, *The Fallacy of a German Peace* (Atlantic Monthly, November); G. Hanotaux, *L'Énigme de Charleroi* (Revue des Deux Mondes, August 15, September 1); Z. Z. Z., *Précisions sur la Bataille de la Marne* (Revue de Paris, September 15); L. Madelin, *La Bataille des Flandres, l'Yser et Ypres* (Revue des Deux Mondes, July 15, August 1); V. Giraud, *Le Miracle Français*, II.

(*ibid.*, August 1); A. Chevrillon, *Visites au Front, sur le Front Anglais, Juin 1916*, II. (*ibid.*, July 15); R. de la Frégeolière, *Croisières Aériennes, Souvenirs et Récits d'un Pilote Militaire* (*ibid.*, October 15); O. Guihéneuc, *La Lutte contre les Sous-Marins* (Revue de Paris, July 15); J. Duhem, *Vue Générale de la Question d'Alsace-Lorraine* (Mercure de France, July 16); A. G. Loraine, *Portugal in the War* (New Europe, August 2).

(See also p. 472.)

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

Mr. G. G. Coulton has gathered a series of extracts soon to be published by the Cambridge University Press under the title *Social Life in Britain from the Conquest to the Reformation*.

The Royal Historical Society has distributed to its members a volume of Magna Carta essays, written by Professors McKechnie and G. B. Adams, Dr. Round, Sir Paul Vinogradoff, and others.

The Scottish Historical Society has recently issued to its members two volumes of *Papers relating to the Army of the Solemn League and Covenant*, edited by Professor C. Sanford Terry of Aberdeen University.

Mr. Herbert Jenkins has published Mr. A. M. W. Stirling's *The Story of the Hothams: from their hitherto unpublished Family Papers*, in two volumes, containing letters from the Four Georges, Frederick the Great, Pym, Mrs. Siddons, and others.

Charles James Fox, Talleyrand, Metternich, Alexander I., and other figures of political importance form the subject-matter of Charles Whibley's *Political Portraits* (Macmillan).

The Magdalen Hospital: the Story of a Great Charity, by Rev. H. Compston (London, Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge), is a history of an institution which was founded in 1758 and, managed chiefly by able London merchants, has been not only of great value in respect to its own ministrations but also a potent example for the creation of many similar institutions since that date.

The Correspondence of Sir Arthur Helps, edited by E. A. Helps (John Lane), contains many unpublished letters from Gladstone, Dean Stanley, Disraeli, Froude, and others.

From correspondence and diaries Mrs. Louise Creighton has completed *The Life and Letters of Thomas Hodgkin*, the Quaker historian and antiquarian, which is published by Messrs. Longmans.

Mr. G. W. E. Russell has followed his *Portraits of the Seventies* by a volume of essays on the last years of the nineteenth century, which he calls *Politics and Personalities* (Scribner).

An authoritative biography of David Lloyd George, by Harold Spender, a friend of long standing, is announced for publication early in 1918, by the George H. Doran Company.

Britain in Arms, by Jules Destrée, translated from the French by J. Lewis May, is the work of a Belgian who felt that England's efforts in the war were not appreciated by the world at large and especially by her own allies.

Margaret of Scotland and the Dauphin Louis, by Louis A. Barbé, is an historical study, based in part on documents in the Bibliothèque Nationale, of the career of the wife of that dauphin who later became Louis XI. of France.

The town council of Glasgow has commissioned Dr. Robert Renwick, town clerk depute, to prepare an extensive history of the city.

Doing My Bit for Ireland (New York, Century Company, 1917, pp. x, 251) by Margaret Skinnider, is the narrative of a participant in the revolt of 1916.

Documentary publications: *Year Books of Edward II.*, vol. XII., 5 Edward II., 1312, ed. W. C. Bolland (Selden Society); *The Register of Thomas Spofford, Bishop of Hereford (1422-1448)*, ed. Arthur T. Bannister (Hereford, Wilson and Phillips); *Register of the Priory of St. Bees*, ed. Rev. James Wilson (Surtees Society, 1915); *The Burgh Records of Dunfermline, 1488-1584*, ed. Erskine Beveridge (Edinburgh, William Brown, 1917, pp. lviii, 600); *Records of the Worshipful Company of Carpenters*, vol. IV., *Wardens' Account Book, 1546-1571*, ed. Bower Marsh (Oxford, University Press, 1916, pp. 288).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: G. B. Grundy, *The Place Names of England* (Quarterly Review, October); M. L. R. Beaven, *The Regnal Dates of Alfred, Edward the Elder, Athelstan* (English Historical Review, October); Miss R. R. Reid, *The Office of Warden of the Marches: its Origin and Early History* (*ibid.*); A. B. White, *Note on the Name Magna Carta* (*ibid.*); A. F. Pollard, *Magna Carta* (History, October); C. H. Firth, *The Expulsion of the Long Parliament* (*ibid.*); R. L. Schuyler, *British Imperial Preference and Sir Robert Peel* (Political Science Quarterly, September); L. Morel, *L'Influence des Penseurs et l'Action Nationale en Grande Bretagne* (Revue des Sciences Politiques, August); D. H. Fleming, *The Influence of the Reformation on Social and Cultured Life in Scotland* (Scottish Historical Review, October); Michael MacDonagh, *The Journals of the Irish Parliament* (Irish Ecclesiastical Record, October); D. A. Chart, *The Irish Levies during the Great French Wars* (English Historical Review, October).

FRANCE

Following the precedents established by Lockroy for the naval records and by Trouillot for the colonial papers, M. Clémentel, the recent minister of posts and telegraphs, ordered the transfer to the Archives Nationales of all despatches over fifty years old, that had passed between

governmental authorities. Pursuant to this order there have already been transferred all despatches since Chappe inaugurated the telegraph in 1794 down to 1845. They will be open to scholars, under certain obvious restrictions.

The Harvard University Press announces a study of Norman governmental, fiscal, ecclesiastical, and judicial institutions by Professor C. H. Haskins, entitled *Studies in Norman Institutions*.

Jean Allenou has published the Latin text, with translation and notes, of the *Enquête par Tourbe ordonnée par Henri II., Roi d'Angleterre* (Paris, Champion, 1917, pp. 102), under the title, *Histoire Féodale des Marais, Territoire, et Église de Dol*. The volume is the thirteenth in the series *La Bretagne et les Pays Celtiques*.

The years 1170-1204 are covered in the second volume of *Chartes de l'Abbaye de Jumièges conservées aux Archives de la Seine-Inférieure* (Paris, Picard, 1916, pp. 424) edited by J. J. Vernier for the Société de l'Histoire de Normandie.

The second volume of the *Ordonnances des Rois de France, Règne de François Ier* (Paris, Imp. Nationale, 1917, pp. 741) covers the years 1517-1520. It is published by the Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques.

To the *National History of France*, earlier volumes of which have been reviewed in this journal (XXII. 640, 706), a translation of Jacques Boulenger's volume has been added, with the title *The Great Century* (Constable).

A. Crémieux has published *Marseille et la Royauté pendant la Minorité de Louis XIV., 1643-1660* (Paris, Hachette, 1917, 2 vols., pp. 894).

Frank Puaux has made a study of Protestant political teachings in *Les Défenseurs de la Souveraineté du Peuple sous le Règne de Louis XIV.* (Paris, Renouard, 1917, pp. 126).

Paul d'Estrée's *Le Maréchal de Richelieu, 1696-1788, d'après les Mémoires Contemporains et des Documents Inédits* (Paris, Émile-Paul, 1917, pp. xxx, 393) has gone into a second edition.

The latest issues of the Société de l'Histoire de France (Paris, Laurens, 1916) are the sixth volume of the *Mémoires de Saint-Hilaire*, covering the years 1711-1715; and the third volume of the *Journal de Jean Vallier, Maître d'Hôtel du Roi, 1648-1657*, dealing with the period from September 1, 1651, to July 31, 1652.

In *La Convocation des États Généraux de 1789 en Languedoc* (Montpellier, Firmin and Montane, 1917, pp. 156), André Mathieu has called attention to the juridical problems involved and the manner in which they were handled.

E. Sevestre, who is well known for his studies on the local history of Normandy and on the church history of the Revolution, has recently published an *Étude Critique des Sources de l'Histoire Religieuse de la Révolution en Normandie, 1787-1801* (Paris, Picard, 1916, pp. vii, 280).

French history during the time of Napoleon and the Empire is the period covered by the *Memoirs of the Comte de Mercy Argenteau*, translated and edited by Mr. George S. Hellman (Putnam).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: J. Flach, *Les Nationalités Régionales de l'Ancienne France dans leurs Rapports avec la Couronne* (Revue Historique, September); J. Clémenceau, *Notes sur les États-Généraux et l'Assemblée Constituante*, I. (Revue Historique de la Révolution Française et de l'Empire, April); G. Rouanet, *Les Séances de la Constituante après le 14 Juillet 1789* (Annales Révolutionnaires, July); E. d'Hauteville, *La Police pendant la Révolution, Organisation et Fonctionnement* (Revue des Études Historiques, July); L. Madelin, *Les Armées de la Révolution et la Discipline* (Revue des Deux Mondes, October 15); A. Mathiez, *Les Subsistances pendant la Révolution*, III. *Les Enragés et la Lutte pour le Maximum, Janvier-Février 1793* (Annales Révolutionnaires, July); M. Marion, *Le Maximum, Mai 1793-Nivôse An III*. (Revue des Études Historiques, July); *id.*, *Les Lois de Maximum sous la Révolution et la Taxation des Salaires* (Compte Rendu de l'Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques, August); G. Lacour-Gayet, *Talleyrand et l'Expédition d'Égypte*, II. (*ibid.*, July); G. Vauthier, *Les Congrégations Religieuses sous l'Empire* (Revue des Études Napoléoniennes, September); H. Welschinger, *The Private Papers of M. Thiers* (Quarterly Review, October).

ITALY, SPAIN, AND PORTUGAL

General review: J. Luchaire and J. Alazard, *Histoire d'Italie, Période Moderne, Fin du XV^e Siècle-Fin du XVIII^e Siècle*, I. (Revue Historique, September).

A considerable portion of the archives of the house of Medici, embracing important correspondence of Lorenzo de' Medici in 1489, 1491, and 1492, is to be sold at auction by Christie, Manson, and Woods, in London, on February 4, 1918. The catalogue is by Mr. Royal Tyler.

The Florence despatches from 1527 to 1609 are published in the third volume of *Relazioni degli Ambasciatori Veneti al Senato* (Bari, Laterza, 1917), edited by A. Segarizzi.

Volume IV., fascicle 1, of the *Rassegna Storica del Risorgimento* presents a mass of varied material, among which is a life of Gen. Domenico Piva by his son Edoardo Piva.

The Macmillan Company expects to publish this spring volumes I. and II. of a *History of Spain*, in four volumes, by Professor Roger B. Merriman of Harvard University.

The *Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas, y Museos*, for July-August, continues the "Relación de las Personas que pasaron á esta Nueva España", companions of Cortés, etc. The accompanying installment of the guide to archives presents the first 48 pages for Simancas.

Seven makers of Portuguese history from the thirteenth to the sixteenth century form the subject of Mr. Aubrey G. F. Bell's *Portuguese Portraits* (Oxford, Blackwell).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. Greppi, *La Repubblica Cisalpina* (Nuova Antologia, July 1); Marquis de Girardin, *La Fuite de Pie IX. à Gaète, Novembre 1848, d'après des Documents Inédits* (Revue des Études Historiques, July); Letizia Chiama, *Inizio del Giornale "Il Risorgimento"*, *Lettere Inedite di C. Cavour ad un Genovese* (Nuova Antologia, July 1); "A French Diplomat", *Portugal's Object Lesson for the United States* (Harper's Magazine, November).

GERMANY, AUSTRIA, AND SWITZERLAND

Protestantism in Germany (Princeton University Press), by Kerr D. Macmillan, president of Wells College, is an analysis of Luther and his doctrines in connection with German national character. Another recent study of Luther is that of Junius B. Remensnyder, *What the World owes Luther*, published by the Fleming H. Revell Company.

Volume II. of Sir A. W. Ward's *Germany, 1815-1890*, in the *Cambridge Historical Series*, covering the years 1852 to 1872, is announced by the Cambridge University Press. The author's treatment of the Schleswig-Holstein question is based in large part on papers left by his father, who was accredited to the Hanse Towns from 1860 to 1870.

Recent additions to the *Bibliothèque d'Histoire Contemporaine* (Paris, Alcan, 1917) include volumes on *L'Empereur Frédéric III., 1831-1888*, by H. Welschinger; and on *Guillaume II., 1890-1899*, by Madame Adam, translated by J. O. P. Bland under the title, *The Schemes of the Kaiser* (Heinemann). *L'Évolution Belliqueuse de Guillaume II.* (Paris, Payot, 1917), by Maurice Muret, continues the author's *L'Orgueil Allemand*. F. De Visscher has published *La Liberté Politique en Allemagne et la Dynastie de Hohenzollern* (Paris, Tenin, 1916, pp. xii, 141), and R. Lote, *Germania: l'Allemagne et l'Autriche dans la Civilisation et l'Histoire* (second ed., Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1917, pp. 330).

Messrs. Thomas Nelson and Sons, of London and New York, have brought out in an English translation the volume noticed by us on its appearance in French, *Germany before the War*, by Baron Beyens, now Belgian minister for foreign affairs, formerly the Belgian minister at the court of Berlin.

A volume of striking, and it must be held typical, expressions from German public men on German aims and ambitions has been issued by Messrs. Appleton under the title, *Out of their Own Mouths*.

German achievements in colonial policy form the subject of *The German Colonial Empire: its Beginning and Ending*, by Paolo Giordani, translated by Mrs. G. W. Hamilton (London, G. Bell).

Professor Bertrand Auerbach of the University of Nancy has published in the *Bibliothèque d'Histoire Contemporaine* a second and revised edition (Paris, Alcan, 1917) of his *Les Races et les Nationalités en Autriche-Hongrie*, originally published in 1899; and Professor Ernest Denis is the author of *La Question d'Autriche: les Slovaques* (third ed., Paris, Delagrave, 1917, pp. 287), published in the *Bibliothèque d'Histoire et de Politique*.

Mr. Herbert Vivian's *Francis Joseph and his Court* (John Lane) is compiled from the memoirs of Count Roger de Rességnier.

La Suisse pendant la Guerre, by Max Turmann (Paris, Perrin), in its two parts discusses the aid given by the Swiss to the wounded and homeless, and the struggle to maintain Switzerland's neutrality and economic existence during the war.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: W. W. Willoughby, *The Prussian Theory of Monarchy* (American Political Science Review, December); Munroe Smith, *Germany's Land-Hunger* (*ibid.*, September); D. J. Hill, *The German Plot and Democracy's Future* (Century Magazine, October).

NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM

W. L. D. van den Brink has written *Bijdrage tot de Kennis van den Economischen Toestand van Nederland in de Jaren 1813-1816* (Amsterdam, Kruyt, 1916, pp. xvi, 235).

The Belgian ministries of justice and foreign affairs have published *Guerre de 1914-1917: Réponse au Livre Blanc Allemand du 10 Mai 1915* (third ed., revised and enlarged, Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1917, pp. 526, and maps). J. van Heuvel has written the preface to the two volumes of reports of the Belgian investigating commission on *La Violation du Droit des Gens en Belgique* (*ibid.*, pp. 168, 198). F. van Langenhove, an official of the Belgian government at Havre, has prepared *Le Dossier Diplomatique de la Question Belge: Recueil des Pièces Officielles avec Notes* (Paris, Van Oest, 1917, pp. viii, 426), which includes the important documents as to the violation of Belgian neutrality and later affairs.

A Spanish witness, F. Orozco Muñoz, a Red Cross volunteer, has related his observations in *La Belgique Violée: Ephémérides de l'Invasion* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1917, pp. xx, 120), which has been translated from the Spanish by J. N. Champeaux, and published with a preface by H. Carton de Wiart, of the Belgian ministry.

Belgium in War-time, by Commandant de Gerlache de Gomery, translated from the French by Bernard Miall (London and New York, Hodder

and Stoughton, 1917, pp. 243), is a volume whose illustrations, maps, and facsimiles lend it peculiar interest, but which is also of much merit as a general narrative summary.

Material for history will be found in *German Legislation for the Occupied Territories of Belgium*, official texts edited by Charles Henry Huberich and Alexander Nicol-Speyer (the Hague, Nijhoff).

The whole story of violations of neutrality, of violations of the Hague Convention, and of miscellaneous barbarity, is told by M. Jean Massart, vice-director of the scientific section of the Belgian Royal Academy, in a volume translated under the title *Belgium under the German Eagle* (New York, E. P. Dutton, pp. 368), of which one salient merit among many is that no documents are used except those which are of German origin or which have been passed by the German censorship.

Déportations Belges à la Lumière des Documents Allemands, by Fernand Passelecq, formerly an advocate in the court of appeals at Brussels (Paris and Nancy, Berger-Levrault, pp. 435), is by far the most important account of its subject, treating with fullness not only all the facts of the German deportations of Belgians, but the leading features of the economic background, such as the Rathenau plan, by which the German government, confiscating nearly all raw materials in Belgium, in occupied France, and in Poland, has been enabled to use them, and all available Belgian labor, for the continuance of the war. Abundant quotations and documents sustain the narrative.

Documents of momentous importance, records of patriotic activity, and constant evidence of high intelligence and noble character, are to be found in *Cardinal Mercier: Pastorals, Letters, Allocutions, 1914-1917*, published with a biographical sketch and preface by Rev. Joseph F. Stillemans, president of the Belgian Relief Fund (New York, P. J. Kenedy and Sons).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: G. Goyau, *Le Cardinal Mercier* (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, August 15).

NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

Besides the issue of the *American-Scandinavian Review*, of volumes of translations of Scandinavian classics (such as the "King's Mirror", ed. Larson), and certain monographs in Scandinavian history, the American-Scandinavian Foundation offers each year a small number of scholarships for American students desiring to go abroad for study in Sweden, Denmark, and Norway. Scholars are appointed in May, but applications must reach the secretary of the Foundation, at 25 West 45th Street, New York, before April 1.

The Cornell University Press is soon to publish a *Catalogue of Runic Literature*, compiled by Mr. Halldor Hermannsson. The catalogue is compiled from the Icelandic collection presented by Willard Fiske to that library.

The last issue of the *Antikvarisk Tidskrift för Sverige*, XXII. 1, is entirely occupied with a monograph by Sune Lindquist, "Den Helige Eskils Biskopsdöme" (pp. 175), in which, by a comparative study of the sepulchral chest found at Eskilstuna in 1912 and of other monuments, he endeavors to reconstruct the ecclesiastical history and conditions of middle Sweden in St. Eskil's time (twelfth century).

S. Posner has discussed the Polish problem in *La Pologne d'Hier et de Demain* (Paris, Alcan, 1916, pp. xii, 124). In the *Reconstruction of Poland and the Near East* (New York, Century Company, 1917), Herbert Adams Gibbons arraigns the inept diplomacy of the Great Powers before and during the present war in dealing with the small nationalities of eastern and southeastern Europe.

In spite of its title, *A History of Poland from the Earliest Times to the Present Day* (Constable), Maj. F. E. Whitton's work may be classed as very modern history, since three-fifths of it deals with the period since 1772. The book is provided with several excellent maps.

Since the Russian revolution, the archivists, curators, and historical scholars of Russia have organized themselves into a Union of Russian Archive Workers ("Soyouz Rossiiskikh Arkhivnikh Deyatelei"), for the purpose of cataloguing and classifying the materials in the different archives, of forming a central record office like that in London, of caring for historical monuments, etc. The chairman of the Union is Professor A. S. Lappo-Danilevski, and the executive committee contains some of the chief scholars in Russia.

A group of Russian and American historical scholars are preparing a work on the history of Russia, in four volumes, under the general editorship of Professors A. S. Lappo-Danilevski and F. A. Golder, to be published by Macmillan and Company of London.

Joseph McCabe has followed his study of the personality of the Kaiser by *The Romance of the Romanoffs*, published by Dodd, Mead, and Company. A book of similar character is *The Last of the Romanoffs* (Constable), by Charles Rivet, Russian correspondent of the *Temps*; the original is published by Perrin.

Various phases of recent events in Russia are revealed in *La Révolution Russe* (Paris, Rivière, 1917), by A. Zévaès; and *La Révolution Russe à Petrograd et aux Armées, Mars-Mai 1917* (Paris, Payot, 1917), which is a journal of observations by C. Anet.

The war has brought several contributions to Rumanian history from the expert pen of Professor N. Jorga, as follows: *Relations des*

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXIII.—30.

Roumains avec les Alliés (Jassy, 1917, pp. 46); *Histoire des Relations Russo-Roumaines* (ibid., pp. 367); *Histoire des Relations entre la France et les Roumains* (ibid., pp. 198); and *Droits Nationaux et Politiques des Roumains dans la Dobrogea: Considérations Historiques* (ibid., pp. 90).

R. W. Seton-Watson brings a wealth of information to the discussion of *The Rise of Nationality in the Balkans* (London, Constable, 1917).

A former deputy to the Bosnian diet, N. Stoyanovitch, is the author of a volume on *La Serbie d'Hier et de Demain* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1917, pp. xiii, 179) for which M. André Tardieu has written the preface.

Dr. Harry Stuermer, a Baden journalist, reveals the development of his feeling of repugnance for German methods during the war, especially for the support of the Young Turks and for the Armenian atrocities, in *Zwei Kriegsjahre in Constantinople: Skizzen Deutschjungtürkischer Moral und Politik* (Paris, Payot, 1917).

Lord Eversley has followed his recent volume on *The Partitions of Poland* by *The Turkish Empire: its Growth and Decay* (Dodd, Mead, and Company).

The J. B. Lippincott Company has recently published *The War and the Bagdad Railway*, by Professor Morris Jastrow, librarian of the University of Pennsylvania.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: P. N. Milyukov, *Russia's Territorial Policies* (Russian Review, July); Count Ilya Tolstoy, *The Evolution of Liberty in Russia* (Century Magazine, September); A. Yarmolinsky, *Censorship in Russia: an Historical Study* (Russian Review, July); E. A. Ross, *The Roots of the Russian Revolution* (Century, December); P. Chasles, *La Révolution Russe et la Guerre Européenne* (Revue des Sciences Politiques, August); J. W. Bienstock, *La Révolution Russe: les Partis Politiques et leurs Chefs* (Mercure de France, August 1); id., *La Révolution Russe, l'Okhrana* [concl.] (ibid., November 1); Raymond Recouly ["Captain X.,"], *The Russian Army and the Revolution* (Scribner's Magazine, November); E. H. Wilcox, *Kerensky and the Revolution* (Atlantic Monthly, November); Marylie Markovitch, *Scènes de la Révolution Russe*, I.-V. (Revue des Deux Mondes, May 15, July 1, August 1, September 1, October 1); C. H. Wright, *The Letts* (Edinburgh Review, October); H. Grinwasser, *Le Code Napoléon dans le Duché de Varsovie: Étude Historique d'après des Documents Inédits* (Revue des Études Napoléoniennes, September); "Alexander Severus", *The Building of Greater Rumania* (New Europe, July 26, August 2); Stanley Washburn, *The Tragedy of Rumania* (Atlantic, December); B. Vosnjak, *L'Administration Française dans les Pays Yougoslaves, 1809-1813* (Revue des Sciences Politiques, August); *Recent Montenegrin History* (New Europe, August 2).

THE FAR EAST AND INDIA

The Legal Obligations arising out of Treaty Relations between China and the Other States, by Min-Ch'ien T. Z. Tyau, LL.D., lecturer on international law, Tsing Hua College, Peking (London, Sweet and Maxwell), begins the account of Chinese foreign relations with 1689 and from that time to the twentieth century traces the relations of China with eighteen sovereign powers.

To his earlier volumes on China in the twentieth century, J. Rodes has added *Scènes de la Vie Révolutionnaire en Chine, 1911-1914* (Paris, Plon, 1917).

The Oxford University Press announces for early publication *Japan: the Rise of a Modern Power*, by Robert P. Porter. The volume is to carry the history of Japan down to November, 1914.

Further Memories, by Lord Redesdale, better known as the author of Mitford's *Tales of Old Japan*, is an addendum to the two volumes of *Memories* previously published; it contains many graphic bits of personal recollection derived from a long diplomatic career. The volume is published in this country by Messrs. E. P. Dutton and Company.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: H. Cordier, *La Suppression de la Compagnie de Jésus et la Mission de Peking* (T'Oung Pao, July, 1916); P. J. Treat, *The Return of the Shimonoseki Indemnity* (Journal of Race Development, July).

AMERICA

GENERAL ITEMS

The Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution of Washington has received from Mr. Luis M. Pérez, librarian of the Cuban House of Representatives, a detailed report on the archives of Jamaica, which he has prepared at the instance of the department. This report is intended to be combined in one volume with a further report, by another hand, upon the archives of the other British West Indies and upon the material relating to all these islands in the Public Record Office; but since these latter portions of the volume must wait for times of peace, the Jamaica report will not be published for the present. It can, however, be consulted in manuscript. The Institution has published, at about the date of issue of this journal, in a volume of 387 pages, *Treaties bearing on the History of the United States and its Dependencies, to 1648*, by Dr. Frances G. Davenport, embracing papal bulls and international treaties—to the number of forty—introductions, texts, translations, references, and annotations, the fruit of long and careful labor.

Among recent accessions of the manuscript division of the Library of Congress are: Vergennes's *Mémoire Historique et Politique sur la*

Louisiane (ca. 1777, a contemporary copy); orderly-book of Joseph Bull, Half-moon to Oswego, 1760; some fifty official letters written by Richard M. Johnson, while acting as United States agent in the West and Southwest, 1808-1847; some thirty-five miscellaneous papers of George Corbin Washington, 1792-1845; about 350 papers of William Wirt, 1805-1840; papers of Rear-Admiral Louis M. Goldsborough, 1830-1877 (7 volumes and 2000 pieces); and a body of letters to John W. Forney, 1854-1856. A considerable number of manuscript and printed papers of Walt Whitman have been deposited in the library.

The *Proceedings* of the American Antiquarian Society at the meeting of April, 1917, embraces an interesting history of Cogswell and Bancroft's Round Hill School by Professor J. S. Bassett, a discussion of types of prehistoric southwestern architecture, by Mr. J. Walter Fewkes, and a body of letters written by Thomas Boylston Adams, brother of John Quincy Adams, mostly in the years from 1799 to 1803, to his cousin William S. Shaw, librarian of the Boston Athenaeum. An installment of Mr. Brigham's Bibliography of American Newspapers, 1690-1820, covering New York (towns from A to L) is presented.

In the October number of the *Catholic Historical Review*, Dr. Herbert F. Wright of the Catholic University of America summarizes the seventeenth-century controversies over the origin of the American aborigines, especially the controversy between Grotius and De Laet; Dr. Gailard Hunt, of the Library of Congress, connects the essential passages of the Virginia Declaration of Rights with passages in the works of Cardinal Bellarmine; the Church in Spanish American History is broadly treated by Dr. Julius Klein, while Mr. W. S. Merrill treats of Catholic Authorship in the American Colonies before 1784, and presents a list of works by Catholic authors printed in America before that date. The annals of the church in Kansas City from 1800 to 1857 are set forth by Vicar-General Keuenhof. Interesting and encouraging data are given respecting the formation and activities of American Catholic historical societies.

In the September issue of the *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society* Rev. Edward J. Curran relates the life of Brother Potamian; the Rev. Dr. Michael Francis O'Reilly and Rev. John M. Lenhardt discuss Édouard Richard's *Acadie*. The papers concerning the Santo Domingo Refugees in Philadelphia are continued, as are also other articles hitherto mentioned.

Volume II. (1645-1773) of "Text" of the *History of the Society of Jesus in North America*, by Father Thomas Hughes, S.J., has come from the press (Longmans).

The twenty-sixth annual meeting of the American Jewish Historical Society will be held in Philadelphia on February 11 and 12.

The editor of the *Magazine of History* begins in the July number the story of Emily Geiger and her Ride (1781). The August number contains a brief paper on Alabama County Names, and another on the Santa Fé Expedition of 1841.

Our Democracy: its Origins and its Tasks, by Professor J. H. Tufts of the University of Chicago, is an attempt to trace the origin and significance of American principles through history, sociology, and politics, presented in untechnical form for the prospective citizen (Holt).

The Unpopular History of the United States by Uncle Sam Himself, as recorded in Uncle Sam's Own Words, is the title of a small volume by Harris Dickson, published by Frederick A. Stokes Company. The book is described as "Some of the less admirable pages of American history brought out in order to save future mistakes."

The President's Control of Foreign Relations, by E. S. Corwin, just issued by the Princeton University Press, is described as "an historical and analytical study of the powers of the legislative and executive branches of the national government in regulating foreign relations of the United States".

Professor T. F. Moran of Purdue University has brought out through Messrs. Crowell a small volume entitled *American Presidents: their Individualism and their Contributions to American Progress*.

The United States Post-Office: its Past Record, Present Condition, and Potential Relation to the New World Era, by Daniel C. Roper, first assistant postmaster-general, 1913-1916, has been published by Funk and Wagnalls.

The Houghton Mifflin Company has issued *A History of American Journalism*, by James M. Lee, head of the New York University School of Journalism and president of the American Association of Teachers of Journalism. The volume contains reproductions of old prints and cartoons.

The American Blind Spot: the Failure of the Volunteer System as shown in our Military History, a concise treatment of the subject by H. C. Washburn, is issued by Doubleday, Page, and Company.

Of the *Cambridge History of American Literature*, edited by Professors W. P. Trent, John Erskine, S. P. Sherman, and Carl Van Doren, volume I. has come from the press (Putnam). The work is to run to three volumes; the present extends into the earlier part of the nineteenth century.

Messrs. C. E. Goodspeed and Company of Boston announce for early publication a new edition of Dunlap's *History of the Rise and Progress of the Arts of Design in the United States* (1834), prepared by Frank

W. Bayley and Charles E. Goodspeed and elaborately illustrated by many reproductions of early American paintings.

Dramatic Moments in American Diplomacy is the title of a work by Ralph W. Page, which Doubleday, Page, and Company have published.

The January-April number of the *German-American Annals* contains a history of the German Drama on the St. Louis Stage, by A. H. Nolle, and some letters from a German poetess and her daughter to Longfellow (1857, 1858, and 1867), which suggest a very different Germany from that of our time.

ITEMS ARRANGED IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

The *Bulletin* of the New York Public Library for August contains several interesting letters of American clergymen of the eighteenth century, specimens from a collection presented by Mr. Simon Gratz of Philadelphia.

Benjamin Franklin Self-Revealed: a Biographical and Critical Study based mainly on his own Writings, in two volumes, by W. C. Bruce, comes from the press of G. P. Putnam's Sons.

An account of the Shakers, based on the manuscript records of several communities, has been compiled by Miss Clara Endicott Sears. The volume is entitled *Gleanings from Old Shaker Journals* (Houghton Mifflin Company).

The History of Legislative Methods in the Period before 1825, by R. V. Harlow, has been published by the Yale University Press.

After some interval since the issue of the sixth volume, the Macmillan Company has published the seventh volume of the *Writings of John Quincy Adams*, edited by Worthington C. Ford, and extending from 1820 to the middle of 1823.

The Life of John Caldwell Calhoun, in two volumes, by W. M. Meigs, has lately come from the press of the Neale Publishing Company.

The Houghton Mifflin Company is publishing *Daniel Webster in England*, edited by Edward Gray, and consisting of extracts from a journal kept by Harriette Story Paige while in England in 1839.

The Life and Letters of Robert Collyer, 1823-1912, in two volumes, is by Rev. J. H. Holmes, who was associated with the noted Unitarian divine during the last five years of his ministry (Dodd, Mead, and Company).

G. S. Bryan is the author of a life of *Sam Houston*, which the Macmillan Company has published.

Mr. William K. Bixby of St. Louis has privately printed in a small volume the intimate letters of Gen. Zachary Taylor, written during the

Mexican War to Dr. Wood, an army surgeon, together with a long and important letter of Taylor to Secretary Buchanan, August, 1847, reviewing the war and the conduct of the administration toward the writer, up to that time.

The Library of Congress has issued a *Calendar of the Papers of Franklin Pierce* (pp. 102). This small body of Pierce papers, obtained by the library in 1905, is said to be the only collection of Franklin Pierce papers now in existence. The preliminary work of calendaring the papers was done by Mr. W. R. Leech; the calendar was completed, revised, edited, and indexed by Mr. John C. Fitzpatrick.

Under the auspices of the Cambridge Historical Society, the letters of John Holmes, brother of Oliver Wendell Holmes, have been collected and are now brought out in a volume edited by Mr. William R. Thayer, to which Miss Alice Longfellow has supplied an introduction. The book, entitled *Letters of John Holmes to James Russell Lowell and Others*, is published by the Houghton Mifflin Company.

The Macmillan Company has issued a *History of the Civil War, 1861-1865*, in one volume, by James Ford Rhodes. Dr. Rhodes states in the preface that this is not an abridgment of the corresponding three volumes of his *History of the United States*, but a fresh study of the subject, although he has now and again transferred sentences, paragraphs, and even pages from the longer to the shorter work.

Abraham Lincoln, by Wilbur F. Gordy, has been published by Messrs. Scribner in the series *Heroes and Leaders in American History*.

In a new edition of her *Life of Abraham Lincoln* Miss Ida Tarbell has utilized material which has been brought to light since her book was first published seventeen years ago (Macmillan).

A Life of Robert E. Lee for Boys and Girls, by J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton and Mary Thompson Hamilton, is published by the Houghton Mifflin Company.

The Private and Official Correspondence of General Benjamin F. Butler, in five volumes, edited and published by Mrs. Jessie Ames Marshall, his granddaughter, 15 State Street, Boston, has come from the press.

The *Memoirs of Colonel John S. Mosby*, leader of Mosby's Partizan Rangers of the Confederacy, has been edited by Charles W. Russell and published by Little, Brown, and Company. The memoirs were completed before Colonel Mosby's death in 1916.

The Neale Publishing Company has brought out a second edition of G. Moxley Sorrell's *Recollections of a Confederate Staff Officer*, with an introduction by John W. Daniel.

The first volume of a *History of the United States since the Civil War*, by E. P. Oberholtzer, has been published by Macmillan. The work will run to five volumes.

Messrs. Little, Brown, and Company have lately published, in two volumes, *The Life and Letters of Edward Everett Hale*, by his son Professor E. E. Hale, jr.

M. M. Ponton has undertaken to relate in a small volume the *Life and Times of Henry M. Turner* (1834-1915), bishop of the African Methodist Episcopal Church (Atlanta, A. B. Caldwell Publishing Company).

Rear-Admiral Charles E. Clark, who commanded the *Oregon* on her famous voyage from San Francisco to Key West at the outbreak of the Spanish-American War and at the battle of Santiago, has published his reminiscences, with the title *My Fifty Years in the Navy* (Little, Brown, and Company).

The Foreign Policy of Woodrow Wilson, 1913-1917, by Edgar E. Robinson and Victor J. West of the department of history of Stanford University, is published by the Macmillan Company.

An English publication on *President Wilson, his Problems and his Policy* (London, Headley, 1917) is by H. W. Harris. The book is published in this country by the Frederick A. Stokes Company under the title *President Wilson: from an English Point of View*.

THE UNITED STATES IN THE WAR

The Committee on Public Information has published in its *War Information Series*, as number 7, *Amerikanische Bürgertreue von Bürgern Deutscher Abkunft* (pp. 23), a German translation of number 6 (*American Loyalty by Citizens of German Descent*) already mentioned in these pages. Number 8 is a pamphlet of sixteen pages, by Professor Evarts B. Greene, of the University of Illinois, entitled *American Interest in Popular Government Abroad*, and giving a history of the active sympathy with liberal movements in Europe, since 1815, exhibited by the people and government of the United States. Number 10, *The First Session of the War Congress* (pp. 48), by Mr. Charles Merz, Washington correspondent of the *New Republic*, is a summary of all the legislation enacted by the Sixty-Fifth Congress in its first session, April-October, 1917, the acts being presented in serial order, with brief accounts of their legislative history and of their provisions.

A new issue in the Committee's "Red, White, and Blue Series", and a more elaborate one than any of its predecessors, is a volume of 170 pages, compiled by Professor Wallace Notestein and Elmer E. Stoll of the University of Minnesota, and entitled *Conquest and Kultur: Aims of the Germans in their Own Words*. A preface by Professor Guy Stanton

Ford, director of the division in the Committee on Public Information under whose auspices these pamphlets are prepared, states forcibly the object of the present issue, to make the American world acquainted with the purposes and methods put forward by the responsible leaders, intellectual and political, of the German people, the "Pied Pipers of Prussianism", by printing translations of a varied mass of their actual utterances. The quotations, from an extraordinary number of public authorities and publicists, are grouped under such heads as: The Mission of Germany; World Power or Downfall; The Worship of Power; War as a Part of the Divine Order; War as the Sole Arbiter; Economic Necessity and Expansion; Dispossession of the Conquered; Pan-Germanism and America; The Coming War; The Programme of Annexations. Only a full and fair presentation of such a record, says the editor, "can enable the American people to know what it is from which they are defending their land, their institutions, and their very lives. Only from such a careful documentary self-revelation of German ideals can they fully know what they must overcome."

In the same series the same division publishes part I. (pp. 94) of *German War Practices*, prepared for the Committee by Professor Dana C. Munro of Princeton University, with the assistance of Professors George C. Sellery of Wisconsin and A. C. Krey of Minnesota. In this pamphlet the methods pursued by the Germans in their warfare are examined with critical care but with an eye less to individual misdeeds than to the responsibility of commanding officers, higher and lower, for unwarrantable methods, definitely authorized or commanded, and therefore of higher significance than any casual acts of individual soldiers. The sections now presented relate to the treatment of civilians, the evidences being grouped under the headings Massacres, Hostages and Screens, Fines, and Deportations and Forced Labor. The materials are sought from sources of high authority, are sifted with judgment, and effectively and intelligently presented.

The Military Information Service of the New York State Library has compiled, and the Resource Mobilization Bureau has published, a manual of 34 pages entitled *America's Part in the World War: Books for Patriotic Americans*, including lists respecting modern warfare, the relation of the United States to Germany and to the world war, the military policy of the United States, etc.

In September the War Department appointed Col. C. C. McCullough, jr., of the Medical Corps, U. S. A., to write a surgical and medical history of America's share in the war, and Capt. Arthur Sweetzer of the Signal Officers' Reserve Corps, to write a history of American military aviation during the war.

M. René Viviani has prepared an account of *La Mission Française en Amérique, 24 Avril-13 Mai 1917* (Paris, Flammarion, 1917). The

mission is also described in *Notes d'un Témoin, les Grands Jours de France en Amérique, Mission Viviani-Joffre, Avril-Mai 1917* (Paris, Plon, 1917); and in the *Journal d'une Française en Amérique, Septembre 1916-Juin 1917* (*ibid.*), published under the pseudonym, E. Altier.

LOCAL ITEMS, ARRANGED IN GEOGRAPHICAL ORDER

One of the striking facts in the development of regional history in 1917 is the rapid increase in the number of state historical journals, organs usually of state historical societies. Following upon the establishment of the *Minnesota History Bulletins* in 1916, we have the first number of the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* appearing in January, in March that of the *Georgia Historical Quarterly*, in July that of the *Michigan History Magazine*, in September that of the *Wisconsin Magazine of History*. These are notable steps in advance.

An historical address delivered in August, in connection with the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Lempster, N. H., appears in the September-October issue of the *Granite Monthly*.

The state of Massachusetts has for some time maintained a Bureau of War Records. The report of the commissioner, Mr. G. W. Pierson, for the years 1915 and 1916 (Public Document no. 66, pp. 8) was issued in the early part of 1917.

The manual prepared for the Massachusetts Constitutional Convention of 1917 embraced a careful *History of the Constitution of Massachusetts*, by Dr. Samuel E. Morison. This has been reprinted as a pamphlet of 72 pages, copies of which may be obtained from Dr. Morison, Concord, Mass.

The October serial of the *Proceedings* of the Massachusetts Historical Society is marked by a paper in which the president, Senator Lodge, surveys the achievements of Congress during the last session. It also contains, reprinted from newspapers of thirty years ago, two journals kept by William (Loughton) Smith, Federalist congressman 1789-1797, and minister to Portugal 1797-1801, during a journey in New England in 1790 and from Philadelphia to Charleston in 1791. This is accompanied by careful notes by Mr. Albert Matthews, in which this William Smith is discriminated from others and his full career and bibliography set forth.

Volume III., no. 1, of the *Smith College Studies in History* is *Joseph Hawley's Criticisms of the Constitution of Massachusetts*, edited by Miss Mary C. Clune, who also furnishes an introductory note upon Hawley's activities in connection with the establishment of the constitution. Two principal documents are embodied in the pamphlet: the amendments to the constitution proposed by the town of Northampton, June 5, 1780, prepared by Joseph Hawley as chairman of a committee,

and Hawley's personal protest of the same date to the constitutional convention. In addition is printed a letter of Hawley, October 28, 1780, declining to serve as senator in the state legislature, which has a direct bearing upon his constitutional views.

The October number of the *Essex Institute Historical Collections* contains an article by Sidney Perley entitled Hathorne: Part of Salem Village in 1700.

A *History of Chelmsford, Massachusetts*, by Rev. Wilson Waters, has been brought out in Lowell (Courier-Citizen Company).

Professor Wilfred H. Munro of Brown University has pleasantly illustrated the history of Bristol, R. I., by a volume of maritime and other narrative chapters entitled *Tales of an Old Sea Port*.

The Connecticut State Library has completed the index to that portion of the archives which has been designated as Revolutionary War, Series I. These papers were selected about 1845 from the files of the general assembly and the committee of the pay table by Sylvester Judd and arranged in thirty-seven volumes. The index, which is made on the dictionary plan of name, subject, and town entries, was prepared by Miss Effie M. Prickett, with the assistance of Miss Mary B. Brewster. Other series of the archives which have hitherto been indexed are: Militia, first and second series, 1678-1789; Revolutionary War, 1763-1789; Private Controversies, 1642-1716; Ecclesiastical, 1659-1789; Towns and Lands, 1629-1790; Susquehanna Settlers, 1775-1796; Travel, 1670-1788; College and Schools, 1661-1789; Civil Officers, 1669-1754; Court Papers, 1696-1705; Crimes and Misdemeanors, 1663-1788; Lotteries and Divorce, 1755-1789; Insolvent Debtors, 1762-1787.

MIDDLE COLONIES AND STATES

The *New York Historical Society Quarterly Bulletin* for October contains an outline history of New York's water supply, together with a portrait of Christopher Colles (1738-1821), an engineer who had part in some of the earlier projects; and a letter of Washington, November 5, 1782, ordering leather breeches. The society is also preparing for publication a catalogue of its collection of newspapers.

Two monographs on the early municipality of New York have been issued among the *Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law*. They are *New York as an Eighteenth Century Municipality*, part 1 (prior to 1731) and part 2 (1731-1776), by A. E. Peterson and G. W. Edwards, respectively.

Messrs. Boni and Liveright have brought out a revised and enlarged edition of *The History of Tammany Hall*, by Gustavus Myers.

The Story of Cooperstown, by Ralph Birdsall, is published in Cooperstown, N. Y., by A. H. Crist Company.

The Buffalo Historical Society has recently received from Mr. Henry R. Howland a considerable number of manuscripts from the papers of John Porteous, a merchant of New York City and Little Falls, N. Y., in the early years of English occupation of the Great Lakes. These and allied documents received with them relate chiefly to various aspects of trade, 1769-1799, in what is now central and western New York and on the Great Lakes. Some of the papers are important for the early history of the garrison at Oswegatchie, now Ogdensburg. The society has also received, from another source, a collection of papers relating to the War of 1812 on the Niagara frontier, including numerous letters received by Erastus Granger, United States Indian agent, and reports of his dealings with the Indians.

Hon. Charles M. Dow, formerly one of the commissioners of the state reservation at Niagara, has prepared for publication a work entitled *The Bibliography and Anthology of Niagara Falls*. The book, which is shortly to be published by the Division of Archives and History at Albany, has partly the nature of a source-book.

The state of New Jersey has issued, as *Archives of the State of New Jersey*, first series, volume XXVIII. (Paterson, 1917, pp. 648), the ninth volume of the late Mr. William Nelson's extracts from American newspapers relating to New Jersey. The extracts are of the years 1772-1773.

The *Proceedings of the New Jersey Historical Society* for July contains the concluding portion of Chancellor William J. Magie's paper entitled New Light on the Famous Controversy in the History of Elizabethtown, a continuation of Jedidiah Swan's orderly book (1776), and the Chalice of Queen Anne, an historical address by Rev. W. N. Jones.

The Story of Princeton, by E. M. Norris, sketches the history of Princeton University from the year 1746 and records in particular the traditions and distinctive features of undergraduate life (Little, Brown, and Company).

Volume II., no. 4, of the *Smith College Studies in History* is a monograph, by Miss Mary A. Hanna, on the *Trade of the Delaware District before the Revolution*, a study based upon extensive investigation of the sources. The Delaware district as here used is essentially the trade area of Philadelphia. A chapter is devoted to a study of economic conditions in the district before 1763, another to the new trade regulations and revenue measures of the period from 1763 to 1773, and a third to an examination of the effect of this legislation. Such a study of a limited economic area is an especial help toward comprehending the economic contest between the colonies and the mother-country and the consequent political contest.

The Pennsylvania Federation of Historical Societies: Acts and Proceedings of the twelfth annual meeting, January 18, 1917, contains re-

ports upon the sundry activities of the federation and a conspectus of the activities of the numerous local historical societies of Pennsylvania.

The Historical Society of Pennsylvania has recently acquired 420 manuscripts, hospital reports, correspondence, etc., of Dr. Lavington Quick, surgeon in the Civil War; and minute-books, certificates of removal, etc., of Chesterfield (N. J.) monthly meeting.

The articles in the October number of the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* are all continuations, namely: Some Material for a Biography of Mrs. Elizabeth Ferguson, *née* Graeme; the Journal of Samuel Rowland Fisher of Philadelphia, 1779-1781; the Orderly-Book of General Edward Hand, 1778, and Pennsylvania Pensioners in the Revolution.

SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

The September number of the *Maryland Historical Magazine* contains a calendar of the Men of Maryland specially Honored by the State or the United States, being a brief record of careers, accompanied by the texts of resolutions, state or federal, whereby the honors were conferred. The list was compiled by Col. Charles Chaillé-Long, and largely supplemented by the editor. Under the title "Two Indian Arrows of those Parts" Lawrence C. Wroth relates something of the history of the payment of the yearly rental required of the lords proprietary of Maryland.

Maryland: the Pioneer of Religious Liberty, by E. S. Riley, is published in Annapolis by the author.

In the Virginia State Library, the archivist has now indexed by counties the file of legislative petitions, the chronological arrangement of which has already been mentioned in these pages.

The Virginia State Board of Education has printed (Richmond, 1917, pp. 195) *Beginnings of Public Education in Virginia, 1776-1860*, by Professor A. J. Morrison, being a study, with much documentary material, of the history of secondary schools, or "academies", of Virginia in relation to the state literary fund.

The *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* continues in the October number the documentary series Minutes of the Council and General Court (1624-1629), Letters of William Byrd, the First (1688), the miscellaneous selection of papers (minutes of a committee of trade and plantations, etc.) under the heading "Virginia in 1681", and the Papers from the Virginia State Auditor's Office. Those under the latter heading in this number are: minutes of the council, June 11, 12, 14, 1697; a proclamation by Governor Culpepper, December 23, 1682, in regard to military stores; "Account of His Majesties Revenue of Two Shillings per Hogshead", October 25, 1715, to April 25, 1716; and a report of a committee on laws on tobacco, November 14, 1713. There is also, as usual, a large amount of genealogical material.

The articles of chief general interest in the October number of the *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* are the Disqualification of Ministers in State Constitutions, by E. G. Swem, and the German Colony of 1717, by A. L. Keith.

Colonial Virginia: its People and Customs, a handsomely illustrated volume, by Mrs. Mary Newton Stanard, comes from the press of Lipincott.

The trustees of Washington and Lee University have resolved upon the collecting of all available facts pertaining to General Robert E. Lee's connection with that university as president, after the Civil War. Professor Franklin L. Riley has been put in charge of the work, and is seeking data from all living men who were students in the college during General Lee's administration. He will, of course, also welcome information from other sources.

The social and legal condition of Virginia negroes in days of Reconstruction is the subject of Dr. John P. McConnell's *Negroes and their Treatment in Virginia, 1865-1867*.

The North Carolina Council of Defense has issued, in a small leaflet, the programme of its Historical Committee for the collection and preservation of materials relating to the Great War.

The issue of the *North Carolina Booklet* for July contains a paper by Archibald Henderson entitled a Federalist of the Old School (Archibald Henderson, 1768-1822); one by Fred A. Olds entitled Our North Carolina Indians; and one by Marshall Delancey Haywood on the State Navy of North Carolina in the War of the Revolution.

Among the contents of the September number of the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* are: William McWhir, an Irish Friend of Washington, by William Harden; Augusta, Georgia, a centennial address, by J. B. Cumming; Topography of Savannah and its Vicinity, a report to the Georgia Medical Society, by Dr. J. E. White, May 3, 1806; Savannah in the Forties, by C. H. Olmstead; the Great Seals of Georgia, by H. R. Goetschius; and a biographical account of Mrs. Eleanor Kinzie Gordon, by G. A. Gordon.

The Georgia Historical Association was organized in Atlanta April 10, 1917, with Lucian Lamar Knight, state compiler of records, as president, Professor Theodore H. Jack of Emory College as vice-president, and Professor Robert P. Brooks of the University of Georgia as secretary-treasurer. The aim of the association is to become state-wide in character, with an extended membership, and it hopes to stimulate wider and larger historical activities in the state than have hitherto prevailed. The *Proceedings* of the first annual session have now come from the press. They include, besides an account of the organization,

with the constitution of the association, a number of papers of interest read at the meeting for organization. They are: the Need for a New Historical Organization in Georgia, by R. P. Brooks; Historiography in Georgia, by T. H. Jack; the Condition of Georgia's Archives, by Mrs. Maud B. Cobb; and Georgia's Most Vital Need: a Department of Archives, by L. L. Knight. There is also a check-list of Georgia archival material in certain offices of the state capitol.

Mississippi having entered upon the occupation of her new state capitol, the old building, dating from 1835 and the centre of many historical associations, has been made the home of the Department of Archives and History.

Publication of the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* was, we understand, begun by the Louisiana Historical Society in January, 1917.

Volume I., 1916-1917, of the *Proceedings* of the Historical Society of East and West Baton Rouge contains an account of the organization of the society and of its activities, including several papers and addresses, and some documents. Among the papers are: Origin of the Name Baton Rouge, by Professor W. O. Scroggs; an account of Lafayette's visit to Baton Rouge in 1825, by Miss Sarah T. Stirling; Notes on the Spanish Régime in East Baton Rouge, by J. A. Loret; the First Council of the American City of Baton Rouge, by Professor M. L. Bonham, jr.; Baton Rouge in History and Literature, by Professor Pierce Butler; and the First Mrs. Jefferson Davis, by Miss Lois L. Simmons. Among the documents is the text of the proceedings of the convention at St. John's Plains, July 25, 26, 27, 1810, a convention called by Governor Delassus of West Florida in view of the overthrow of Ferdinand VII. of Spain by Napoleon; a letter of about the same time concerning the organization of a junta in behalf of Ferdinand; and a letter of a British officer, January 28, 1815, concerning the battle of New Orleans.

G. P. Putnam's Sons announce for early publication *Reconstruction in Louisiana*, by Ella Lonn.

WESTERN STATES

The *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* for September opens with Professor Paxson's presidential address before the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, an entertaining account of an important subject, The Rise of Sport in the United States. Mr. B. H. Schockell of the Terre Haute Normal School describes the settlement and development of the lead and zinc mining region of northwestern Illinois and southwestern Wisconsin; and Professor J. A. James gives the history of Spanish influence in the West during the American Revolution. In the valuable series of quarterly surveys for which we look to the successive issues of this journal, the present number is marked by an account of historical activities in Canada, 1916-1917, by Mr. Lawrence J. Burpee

of Ottawa. Professor C. E. Fryer presents a group of bibliographical notes on pamphlets respecting the Canada-Guadeloupe controversy.

The proceedings of the tenth annual meeting of the Ohio Valley Historical Association, held at Indianapolis in October, 1916, in connection with the Indiana centennial celebration, have been edited by Professor Harlow Lindley and published as *Indiana Historical Society Publications*, vol. VI., no. 1 (pp. 269).

In the July number of the *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Quarterly* is an extended study, by William C. Mills, of the Feurt Mounds and Village Site, near the city of Portsmouth, Ohio.

The *Quarterly Publication of the Historical and Philosophical Society of Ohio* reprints in a double number (vol. XII., nos. 2 and 3, April-June and July-September, 1917) *A View of the President's Conduct concerning the Conspiracy of 1806*, by J. H. Daveiss, printed in Frankfort, Ky., in 1807. This reprint is edited by I. J. Cox and Helen A. Swineford.

Rev. Dr. George F. Smythe of Gambier, Ohio, has been officially appointed to write a history of the Episcopal church in that state. He will be glad to learn of materials additional to those now in his possession, and especially to be allowed the use of letters of early settlers, or other documents, which may illustrate religious conditions in general in Ohio, particularly in the Episcopalian denomination, in the period preceding 1825. Another desideratum is material regarding the resignation of Rev. Philander Chase, afterwards Bishop Chase, from Christ's Church, Hartford, Conn.

The principal article in the September number of the *Indiana Magazine of History* is a paper, by Charles Zimmerman, on the Origin and Development of the Republican Party in Indiana, 1854-1860. H. L. Smith gives an account of the Underground Railroad in Monroe County, and Logan Esarey writes concerning the Pioneer Aristocracy.

The Illinois Historical Survey has acquired from Professor Charles H. Cunningham of the University of Texas carbon copies of the material copied by him for the Library of Congress from the Archivo General de Indias in Seville. This material, which amounts to between 7000 and 8000 pages, relates to early Louisiana and to the period of the Revolution.

The Illinois Centennial Commission has issued a substantial volume entitled *Illinois in 1818*, prepared by Solon J. Buck. The volume includes portraits, maps, facsimiles, etc. The commission has in press *The Pioneer State, 1818-1848*, by Theodore C. Pease. This is the first volume of the *Centennial History of Illinois*, in five volumes, projected by the commission and prepared under the general direction of Professor C. W. Alvord.

The Making of Illinois: a History of the State from the earliest Records to the Present Time, by Irwin F. Mather, is brought out in Chicago by Flanagan.

Mr. Allan Nevin's *Illinois*, in the series *American Colleges and Universities*, is particularly interesting in the space devoted to the early years of the university.

The Illinois and Michigan Canal: a Study in Economic History, by Dr. James W. Putnam, has been issued by the University of Chicago Press. The study constitutes vol. X. of the Chicago Historical Society's *Collections*. The author relates the history of the canal and discusses its economic influence from its inception early in the nineteenth century well down to the present time, including a discussion of the problem, yet unsettled, of a great waterway from the Lakes to the Mississippi.

The articles in the September number of the *Tennessee Historical Magazine* are a paper, by George B. Jackson, on John Stuart, Superintendent of Indian Affairs for the Southern District, and a sketch, by Roscoe Nunn, of William Ferrell, the meteorologist, whose earlier scientific work was done during a residence of about eleven years in Nashville or its vicinity. The documentary offering of this number of the *Magazine* is some correspondence of John Bell of Tennessee, namely, three letters to Willie P. Mangum and one from Mangum to Bell (1835), and twenty-six letters (1839-1857) from Bell to Colonel William B. Campbell of Tennessee. The Bell correspondence is edited, with introductions and notes, by Professor St. George L. Sioussat.

The second number (October) of the *Michigan History Magazine* contains a group of interesting letters written by Hon. Washington Gardner when a young soldier in the Civil War. The letters are of the years 1863 and 1864 and are written from Murfreesboro, Chattanooga, Knoxville, Nashville, and other points in Tennessee. Among the articles in the *Magazine* are: Teaching Michigan History in the Public Schools, by Alvin N. Cody; History of St. Mary's Parish, Marshall, Michigan, by Rev. James Cahalan; Government Survey and Charting of the Great Lakes from the Beginning of the Work in 1841 to the Present, by John Fitzgibbon; Michigan and the Holland Immigration of 1847, by Hon. Gerrit Van Schelven; and Holland Emigration to Michigan: its Causes and Results, by Hon. Gerrit J. Diekema. This number contains also a descriptive list of the papers of Governor Austin Blair in the Burton Library, Detroit.

The Michigan Historical Commission has inaugurated a series of prizes, similar to those of the National Board for Historical Service, for the best essays on the subject "Why the United States is at War?"

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXIII.—31.

Volume XXIV. of the *Collections* of the Wisconsin Historical Society is probably published before the date of this journal and will be followed soon by volume XXV. The former is made up from the Draper Collection, under the title *Frontier Retreat on the Upper Ohio, 1779 to 1781*; the latter is to consist of the letters of Edwin Bottomley, a pioneer farmer in Racine County, written to his father in England, in the years 1842-1850. The second volume of the *Calendars* of the Draper Collection will also appear before long.

To the *Minnesota Historical Bulletin* and to the *Michigan History Magazine*, whose first two numbers were described in our last issue, the State Historical Society of Wisconsin added in September another handsome journal of the history of the old Northwest, the *Wisconsin Magazine of History*, to be issued quarterly. The first number makes an excellent beginning with an article by the editor, Dr. M. M. Quaife, on Increase Allen Lapham, first scholar of Wisconsin; a narrative by John L. Bracklin, lumberman, of a forest fire in northern Wisconsin in 1898; and a paper by Dr. Louise Phelps Kellogg on Bankers' Aid in 1861-1862. Of the same period as the latter is an interesting diary kept at the University of Wisconsin in the spring of 1861, by the late Harvey Reid. Briefer contributions, on Wisconsin's first versifiers, on the spelling of Jolliet, on the first edition of the Zenger trial, on Colonel E. E. Ellsworth's activities in Wisconsin, on the Apostle Islands, and on the services of the Menominee in the Black Hawk War, appeal to a wide variety of interests. The number concludes with notes on the historical activities of the society and of other agencies in the state and Northwest. It is easy to predict that its successors will be looked for with great interest.

Two Wisconsin county histories which are to appear before long are one of Trempealeau by Dr. E. T. Pierce, to be published by the Cooper Company of Chicago and Winona, and one of Door County, by Hjalmar R. Holand, to be published by the Lewis Company of Chicago.

It is expected that the new building erected by the state for the Minnesota Historical Society will be dedicated in May, when the Mississippi Valley Historical Association will hold its annual meeting in St. Paul, but a partial occupancy of the building has already begun. The society has received from Professor W. W. Folwell a part of his files of correspondence accumulated during many years of service to Minnesota.

The *Minnesota Historical Bulletin* for August is mainly occupied with a thoroughgoing study of the development of banking in Minnesota, by Mr. Sidney A. Patchin.

Acta et Dicta, the organ of the Catholic Historical Society of St. Paul, continues in its January number Archbishop Ireland's life of Bishop Cretin. Rev. J. M. Reardon has an article on Abbé Albert

Lacombe (1827-1916), Oblate missionary in the Canadian Northwest; and there is a translation of a lecture delivered in 1863 by Bishop Baraga of Marquette respecting the American Indian, and two letters of Bishop Loras of Dubuque, 1832 and 1836.

The State Historical Society of Iowa is publishing a series of small pamphlets bearing the general title *Iowa and War*. The five numbers thus far issued have the specific titles: Old Fort Snelling, Enlistments from Iowa during the Civil War, the Iowa Civil War Loan, Equipment of the Iowa Troops in the Civil War, and Iowa and War. The papers are by several hands. The society has recently issued *The Legislation of the Thirty-Seventh General Assembly*, being a guide to the legislation of the last general assembly of Iowa. Some of these appear also as articles in the *Iowa Journal of History and Politics*.

Missouri's centennial celebration will begin on January 8, 1918, her first petitions for statehood having been presented in Congress by her territorial delegate on that date in 1818. The date will be observed in schools and by the State Historical Society. The society reports accessions of nearly 500 volumes of Missouri newspapers.

The *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* for October contains a paper by Professor William L. Schurz on the Manila Galleon and California, some Notes on Early Texas Newspapers, 1819-1836, by Professor Eugene C. Barker, an account of the Archivo General de Indias, by Professor C. E. Chapman, and an interesting collection of Contemporary Poetry of the Texan Revolution, contributed by Alex. Dienst.

The Texas State Library has published *Governors' Messages, Coke to Ross, inclusive, 1874-1891* (pp. 820), inaugurating an "executive series" of the *Collections of the Archive and History Department*.

The Kansas State Historical Society has printed for distribution a list of duplicates of Kansas state and miscellaneous publications in its possession, which it holds for exchange and of which historical organizations elsewhere may be glad to know.

The University of Colorado will shortly bring out the first volume in a series to be called *University of Colorado Historical Collections*. It will contain the records of the Greeley colony, edited by Professor James F. Willard. The series is to be devoted to similar collections of documentary material dealing with the history of Colorado and contiguous territory.

The October number of the *Washington Historical Quarterly* includes among its contents a Record of the San Poil Indians, by R. D. Gwydir; Port Orchard Fifty Years ago, by W. B. Seymore; David Thompson's Journeys in the Spokane Country, by T. C. Elliott; Washington Geographic Names, by Professor Edmond S. Meany; and a series

of letters bearing upon the attitude of the Hudson's Bay Company during the Indian War of 1855-1856, contributed, with an introduction, by Clarence B. Bagley.

The principal content of the June number of the *Quarterly of the Oregon Historical Society* is a continuation of Fred W. Powell's biography of Hall J. Kelley. T. C. Elliott discusses the question, Where is Point Vancouver? and John E. Rhees the meaning, origin, and application of the name Idaho.

Dr. Rockwell D. Hunt, president of the Historical Society of Southern California and professor of economics in the University of Southern California, is preparing a biography of General John Bidwell, prominent California pioneer, agriculturist, and politician. He will greatly appreciate it if persons having letters or other Bidwell materials will address him at Los Angeles, in care of the university named.

The Philippines, in two volumes, by Charles B. Elliott, formerly justice of the supreme court of the Philippines and member of the Philippine Commission, comes with a preface by Hon. Elihu Root. The first volume is devoted to a history of the military régime, to the capture of Aguinaldo; the second brings the narrative down to the time of the reorganization of the government in 1916 (Bobbs-Merrill).

CANADA

The George H. Doran Company has brought out *The Canadian Confederation and its Leaders*, by M. O. Hammond, originally published in Toronto.

AMERICA, SOUTH OF THE UNITED STATES

Mrs. Nelson O'Shaughnessy's *Diplomatic Days*, which pertains to the days of Madero in Mexico, as her earlier work, *A Diplomat's Wife in Mexico*, was concerned with the time of Huerta régime, has been brought out by Harper and Brothers.

A large section of Peruvian history in the nineteenth century is covered by J. Rada y Gamio in *El Arzobispo Goyeneche y Apuntes para la Historia del Perú* (Rome, Vaticana, 1917, pp. xlviii, 954).

A small volume of rather popular character by R. Levillier gives an account of *Les Origines Argentines: la Formation d'un Grand Peuple* (Paris, Fasquelle, 1917).

A committee of scholars in the faculty of philosophy and letters of the University of Buenos Aires is preparing a history of Argentine commerce, in five volumes, extensively documented and ably edited. Volume I., dealing with the period prior to 1810, is being edited by Dr. Emilio Ravignani of the faculty named, and will soon appear. It contains valuable documents dealing with the early trade relations between Argentina and the United States.

Georges Lafond writes with official experience and information in *L'Effort Français en Amérique Latine* (Paris, Payot, 1917). *L'Amérique Latine et la Guerre Européenne* (Paris, Hachette, 1916, pp. viii, 204) consists of articles by representative persons from most of the Latin-American countries expressing pro-ally, especially pro-French, sentiments.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: D. M. Andrews, *De Soto's Route from Cofitachequi in Georgia to Cosa in Alabama* (American Anthropologist, January); B. W. Barnard, *The Use of Private Tokens for Money in the United States* (Quarterly Journal of Economics, August); Susan H. Walker, *George Mason of Gunston Hall* (Daughters of the American Revolution Magazine, November); J. S. Reeves, *Prussian-American Treaties* (American Journal of International Law, July); J. M. Morgan, *The Pioneer Ironclad* (United States Naval Institute Proceedings, October); L. G. Tyler, *The South and Germany* (Confederate Veteran, November); E. D. Ross, *Horace Greeley and the South, 1865-1872* (South Atlantic Quarterly, October); Maj. R. E. Wylie, *The Quebec Campaign of 1759* [cont.] (Journal of the Military Service Institution, September-October); Desdévies du Dezert, *Vice-Rois et Capitaines-Généraux des Indes Espagnoles à la Fin du XVIII^e Siècle*, II. (Revue Historique, September); Edith O'Shaughnessy, *Diplomatic Days in Mexico*, II., III. (Harper's Magazine, October, November); G. Porras Troconis, *Bolívar y la Independencia* (Cuba Contemporánea, November).

LIST OF DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS IN HISTORY NOW IN PROGRESS AT THE CHIEF AMERICAN UNI- VERSITIES, DECEMBER, 1917

[In 1897 the compiler of this list began the practice of collecting, from professors of American history having charge of candidates for the doctor's degree, lists of the subjects of their dissertations. These were then circulated among the professors, in typewritten form, to avoid duplication and for other purposes. Subsequently the list was enlarged to include all subjects, and not solely the American. In 1902 the practice began of printing the lists. That for December, 1909, was accompanied by a list of those historical dissertations which had been printed. The list for December, 1912, was printed in the *History Teacher's Magazine* for January, 1913; those for December, 1913, 1914, 1915, and 1916 in this journal (XIX. 450-465, XX. 484-502, XXI. 421-440, XXII. 486-508). Copies of the printed lists for the years 1910, 1911, 1914, 1915, and 1916 can still be supplied by the compiler, J. F. Jameson, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.]

GENERAL

- T. C. Shaffer, A.B. Pennsylvania 1910, A.M. 1911. History of the Theory of Sovereignty as Will. *Columbia*.
- H. E. Barnes, A.B. Syracuse 1913, A.M. 1914. The Contribution of Sociology to the History of Political Theories. *Columbia*.

ANCIENT HISTORY

- C. H. Oldfather, A.B. Hanover 1906. Egyptian Education in the Ptolemaic and Roman Periods. *Wisconsin*.
- W. E. Caldwell, A.B. Cornell 1910. Development of the Ideas of War and Peace among the Ancient Greeks. *Columbia*.
- Lida R. Brandt, A.B. Wellesley 1916. Some Aspects of Greek Society in the Seventh and Sixth Centuries. *Columbia*.
- Carl Huth, A.B. Wisconsin 1904, A.M. 1905. Rights and Customs of Sanctuary in Ancient Greece and Rome. *Columbia*.
- E. C. Hunsdon, A.B. Barnard 1908. Epigraphic Studies in the History of the Delphic Amphictyony. *Columbia*.
- H. G. Teel, A.B. Dickinson 1911, A.M. 1912. Athenian Social Conditions represented in the Orations of Lysias. *Columbia*.
- C. W. Blegen, A.M. Minnesota 1907; A.B. Yale 1908. Studies in the History of Ancient Corinth. *Yale*.
- S. P. R. Chadwick, A.B. Harvard 1892, A.M. 1899. The Conditions of Italian Colonization during the Government of the Roman Senate. *Harvard*.
- G. W. Leffington, A.B. Vassar 1913, A.M. 1915. Social Life in Rome in the Time of Plautus and Terence. *Columbia*.

- L. A. Lawson, A.B. Upsala 1909; A.M. Columbia 1911. Social Conditions in the Principate of Augustus. *Columbia*.
- M. F. Lawton, A.B. Columbia 1904, A.M. 1912. Philanthropy in Rome and Italy under the Early Roman Empire. *Columbia*.
- D. McFayden, A.B. Toronto 1896; Ph.D. Chicago 1916. Studies in the Reign of Domitian. *Chicago*.
- Margaret Bancroft, A.B. Wellesley 1912; A.M. Columbia 1913. The Popular Assemblies in the Municipalities of Spain and Gaul. *Columbia*.
- Maud Hamilton, A.B. Cornell 1902. The Sources of Metal and Ore Supplies in the Roman Empire. *Wisconsin*.
- J. M. Dadson, A.B. McMaster 1906, A.M. 1909, Th.B. 1909. Persistence of Paganism in the Roman Empire. *Chicago*.
- Elsie S. Jenison, Wellesley 1916. History of the Province of Sicily. *Columbia*.
- R. N. Blews, A.B. Greenville 1904; Ph.D. Cornell 1913. The Roman Law of Heraclea. *Cornell*.

EARLY CHURCH HISTORY

- W. A. Tilley, A.B. McMaster 1910, Th.B. 1912; A.M. Chicago 1915. Attitude of Eastern Churchmen of the Fourth Century toward Property and Property Rights. *Chicago*.

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

- J. E. Dunlop, A.B. Ripon 1910; A.M. Michigan 1914. The Office of *Praepositus Cubiculi* in the Roman and Byzantine Empires from the Fourth to the Ninth Century. *Michigan*.
- J. B. Hubbard, A.B. Wisconsin 1912, A.M. 1913. The History of Economic Thought during the Middle Ages. *Harvard*.
- T. P. Oakley, A.B. Cornell 1909. The Penitentials. *Columbia*.
- Norman Winestine, A.B. Yale 1914. The Attitude of the Papacy toward the Jews, to 1216. *Pennsylvania*.
- Ernest Hahn, Concordia Seminary 1916. A History of the Monastery of Zwifalten from 1089 to 1138. *Chicago*.
- H. H. Maurer, A.B. Wisconsin 1907, A.M. 1909; Ph.D. Chicago 1914. Feudal Procedure in the Courts of the Kingdom of Jerusalem. *Chicago*.
- T. C. Van Cleve, A.B. Missouri 1911, A.M. 1912. John Holywood's *Sphaera*. *Wisconsin*.
- W. K. Gotwald, A.B. Wittenberg 1905, A.M. 1910; D.B. Hamma Divinity School 1908. The Church Censure in the Fifteenth Century. *Johns Hopkins*.

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

- G. E. Nunn, S.B. Chicago 1906; A.M. California 1915. Geographical Explorations of the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries. *California*.

- M. W. Kingsley, A.B. Tufts 1903, A.M. 1904. A Study of Italian Relations with Turkey, 1453-1488. *Illinois*.
- A. P. Evans, A.B. Cornell 1911, Ph.D. 1916. The Sectaries at Nuremberg, 1524-1528: an Episode in the Struggle for Religious Liberty. *Cornell*.
- C. L. Grose, A.B. Findlay 1910; A.M. Harvard 1914. A Study in Restoration Anglo-French Relations. *Harvard*.
- Frances M. Fay, A.B. Radcliffe 1912, A.M. 1913. Trade Policy of England and France from 1689 to 1715. *Radcliffe*.
- F. J. Manning, A.B. Yale 1916. Anglo-French Relations in the last Quarter of the Eighteenth Century. *Yale*.
- Margaret W. Piersol, A.B. Vassar 1912; A.M. Pennsylvania 1914. England and France in the Mediterranean during the Continental System. *Pennsylvania*.
- R. F. Kelley, A.B. 1915, A.M. 1917. Diplomatic History of the Crimean War. *Harvard*.
- J. V. Fuller, A.B. 1914. The Foreign Policy of Bismarck's Later Years. *Harvard*.
- W. E. Warrington, S.B. Pennsylvania 1915, A.M. 1916. The Use of Railroads for Military Purposes in Europe. *Pennsylvania*.

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

- A. J. Meyer, A.B. Rutgers 1900; A.M. New Brunswick Theological Seminary 1904. A History of the Observance of the Lord's Day, with special reference to Great Britain. *Columbia*.
- A. H. Sweet, A.B. Bowdoin 1913; A.M. Harvard 1914; Ph.D. Cornell 1917. The Relations of the English Benedictine Houses to the Papacy and the Episcopacy during the Thirteenth Century. *Cornell*.
- W. O. Ault, A.B. Baker 1907; B.A. Oxford 1910. The Private Court in England. *Yale*.
- James Kenney, A.B. Toronto 1907; A.M. Wisconsin 1908. An Introduction to the Sources for the Early History of Ireland. *Columbia*.
- J. L. Moore, A.B. Harvard 1914, A.M. 1915. The Lawmen and the Justicia. *Harvard*.
- C. W. David, B.A. Oxford 1911; A.M. Wisconsin 1912. Robert Curthose. *Harvard*.
- H. H. Holt, B.A. Oxford 1908; A.M. Wisconsin 1909. The Cost of Living in England, 1172-1183. *Wisconsin*.
- H. A. Kellar, A.B. Chicago 1909. King John: the Interdict and Exchequer. *Wisconsin*.
- P. B. Schaeffer, A.B. Kansas 1913; A.M. Wisconsin 1915. Gervase of Tilbury. *Harvard*.
- Frederic Schenck, A.B. Harvard 1909; Litt.B. Oxford 1912; A.M. Harvard 1914. London Merchants in the Reign of Edward I. *Harvard*.
- Carl Wittke, A.B. Ohio State 1913; A.M. Harvard 1914. The History of Parliamentary Privilege in England. *Harvard*.

- Harriett Bradley, A.B. Vassar 1913. Agrarian Problems of the Sixteenth Century in England. *Columbia*.
- E. C. Macklin, A.B. Indiana 1911; D.B. Union Theological Seminary 1914. Social and Philanthropic Work of the Church of Scotland in the Sixteenth Century. *Columbia*.
- Susan M. Lough, Ph.B. Chicago 1907, Ph.M. 1909. Administration of Ireland in the Time of Elizabeth. *Chicago*.
- J. E. Gillespie, A.B. Cornell 1909; A.M. Harvard 1910. The Influence of Oversea Expansion on England to 1700. *Columbia*.
- H. E. Grimshaw, S.B. Columbia 1914, A.M. 1915. Influence on England of India under the Rule of the Company. *Columbia*.
- Anna K. Boutelle, A.B. Minnesota 1904, A.M. 1914. A Biography of Robert Rich, Second Earl of Warwick, with special reference to his Colonial Activities. *Minnesota*.
- R. G. Adams, A.B. Pennsylvania 1914. The Foreign Correspondence of Robert, Second Earl of Essex. *Pennsylvania*.
- A. P. Watts, A.B. Occidental 1914; A.M. California 1916. Oliver Cromwell and the Capture of Jamaica, 1655. *California*.
- B. C. Schmidt, A.B. Pennsylvania 1913. John Wilmot, Second Earl of Rochester: his Life and Works. *Pennsylvania*.
- F. C. Galpin, A.B. Yale 1910, A.M. 1907. The Rise of Political Non-conformity in England after 1660. *Yale*.
- G. F. Zook, A.B. Kansas 1906, A.M. 1907. The Royal African Company, 1662-1715. *Cornell*.
- Leland Jenks, A.B. Ottawa 1913; A.M. Kansas 1914. Social Aspects of the Revolution of 1688-1689 in England. *Columbia*.
- F. R. Flournoy, A.B. Washington and Lee 1905; A.M. Columbia 1912. The Extent of Parliamentary Control of Foreign Policy in Great Britain. *Columbia*.
- R. G. Booth, A.B. Illinois Wesleyan 1914; A.M. Columbia 1915. Some Social Aspects of the Development of the Natural Sciences in England in the Eighteenth Century. *Columbia*.
- Alden Anderson, A.B. Bethany 1910. British Trade in the Baltic in the Eighteenth Century. *Yale*.
- E. S. Furniss, A.B. Coe 1911. The Social Position of the English Laborer in the Eighteenth Century. *Yale*.
- W. T. Morgan, A.B. Ohio 1909; A.M. Harvard 1910; Ph.D. Yale 1916. The Whig Party, 1700-1720. *Yale*.
- E. P. Smith, A.B. Goucher 1904; A.M. Columbia 1909. The Rise of English Rationalism. *Columbia*.
- Isabel McKenzie, A.B. Barnard 1912; A.M. Columbia 1914. Social Activities of English Friends in the Period of the Industrial Revolution. *Columbia*.
- R. L. Tucker, A.B. Wesleyan 1913; A.M. Columbia 1915. The Relations of the Methodists to the Church of England in the Eighteenth Century. *Columbia*.

- Witt Bowden, A.B. Colorado 1914. The Transition from Hand Manufacturing to Mechanical Production in England, 1754-1793. *Pennsylvania*.
- A. H. Basye, A.B. Kansas 1904, A.M. 1906; Ph.D. Yale 1917. The Board of Trade, 1748-1782. *Yale*.
- J. S. Custer, A.B. William Jewell 1907; B.A. Oxford 1910; Ph.D. Wisconsin 1917. The Constitutional Act of 1791: a Study in British Colonial Policy for the Period from 1774 to 1791. *Wisconsin*.
- Norman Macdonald, A.B. Queen's (Kingston) 1913. Henry Dundas, First Lord Melville, 1742-1811. *Cornell*.
- J. A. Woolf, Ph.B. Chicago 1912. The Political Theory of Jeremy Bentham. *Chicago*.
- Leland Olds, A.B. Amherst 1912. Social Unrest in England, 1811-1819. *Columbia*.
- F. C. Swanson, A.B. Illinois 1914; A.M. 1915. Education and the Democratic Movement in England, 1815-. *Yale*.
- D. G. Barnes, A.B. Nebraska 1915; A.M. Harvard 1917. Enclosures in England during the First Half of the Nineteenth Century. *Pennsylvania*.
- Paul Knaplund, A.B. Red Wing Seminary 1913; A.M. Wisconsin 1914. British Colonies and Imperial Defence, 1860-1915. *Wisconsin*.
- J. H. Park, A.B. Columbia 1912, A.M. 1913. The English Reform Bills of 1866-1867. *Columbia*.
- G. A. Hedger, A.B. Utah 1906. The Position of the British Labor Party in Relation to Foreign Policy. *Cornell*.
- Helen H. Taft, A.B. Bryn Mawr 1915. The Colonization and Early History of Australia. *Yale*.

FRANCE

- N. S. Parker, A.B. Chicago 1911; A.M. Harvard 1912; Ph.D. Chicago 1916. Trade Routes in Southern France in the Middle Ages. *Chicago*.
- R. Joranson, A.B. Augustana 1908; A.M. Wisconsin 1914. The Dane-geld in France. *Chicago*.
- S. R. Packard, A.B. Amherst 1915; A.M. Harvard 1916. The Transition from Plantagenet to Capetian Rule in Normandy. *Harvard*.
- C. G. Kelly, A.B. Johns Hopkins 1908, Ph.D. 1916. French Protestantism on the Eve of the Religious Wars, 1559-1562. *Johns Hopkins*.
- F. C. Palm, A.B. Oberlin 1914; A.M. Illinois 1915. The Economic Policies of Richelieu. *Illinois*.
- J. S. Will, A.B. Toronto 1897. The Persecution of the Huguenots in France under Louis XIV. *Columbia*.
- L. B. Packard, A.B. Harvard 1909. Some Antecedents of the *Conseil du Commerce* of 1700. *Harvard*.
- H. L. Scott, Ph.B. Denison 1911. The Social Influence of Oversea Expansion on France, to 1785. *Columbia*.

- C. O. Hardy, A.B. Ottawa 1904; Ph.D. Chicago 1916. The Race Question during the French Revolution. *Chicago*.
- P. W. MacDonald, A.B. Wisconsin 1910, A.M. 1911. A Study of the Committee of Public Safety during the Reign of Terror, with regard to its Centralizing Policy and its Relations to the Local Authorities. *Wisconsin*.
- Annie Bezanson, A.B. Radcliffe 1915, A.M. 1916. A Study of the Industrial Revolution in France. *Radcliffe*.
- Lucy Lewis, A.B. Bryn Mawr 1893; A.M. Pennsylvania 1915. The Continental System and French Industry. *Pennsylvania*.
- D. P. Frary, A.B. Yale 1914. French Elections under the Restoration. *Yale*.
- E. T. Kelley, A.B. Missouri 1915, A.M. 1916. The Relations of England and France during the First Ten Years of the July Monarchy. *Pennsylvania*.
- W. W. Jamison, A.B. Yale 1911; A.M. Harvard 1917. Industry and Commerce in France, 1830-1848. *Harvard*.
- E. P. Brush, A.B. Smith 1909; A.M. Illinois 1912. Guizot in the Reign of Louis Philippe. *Illinois*.
- P. T. Moon, S.B. Columbia 1913. Development of the Political and Social Programme of the *Action Libérale* in Modern France. *Columbia*.
- D. O. Clark, A.B. Drury 1896; A.M. Illinois 1911. Cabinet Government in France. *Illinois*.

ITALY, SPAIN, AND PORTUGAL

- A. F. Peine, A.B. Illinois Wesleyan 1911; A.M. Illinois 1913. Cola di Rienzi and the Popular Revival of the Empire. *Illinois*.
- Keith Vosburg, A.B. California 1910; A.B. Oxford 1913. The Renaissance at the Neapolitan Court, 1435-1503. *Harvard*.
- Gertrude B. Richards, A.B. Cape Girardeau 1909; A.M. Wellesley 1910; Ph.D. Cornell 1915. Gianfrancesco Pico della Mirandola. *Cornell*.
- C. E. Asnis, A.B. Pennsylvania 1904, LL.B. 1907, A.M. 1913. The Development of Italy's Position in the Triple Alliance. *Pennsylvania*.
- A. Neuman, S.B. Columbia 1909, A.M. 1912. Jewish Communal Life in Spain during the Thirteenth Century. *Columbia*.
- J. G. McDonald, A.B. Indiana 1909, A.M. 1910. The Spanish *Corregidor*; Origin and Development. *Harvard*.
- F. E. J. Wilde, A.B. Wisconsin 1911, A.M. 1912. The Career of Don Antonio of Portugal. *Wisconsin*.

GERMANY, AUSTRIA, AND SWITZERLAND

- F. Lauer, A.B. Iowa Wesleyan 1908; A.M. Northwestern 1914. The Dominican Order in Germany. *Chicago*.
- H. C. Engelbrecht, Concordia Seminary 1917. Economic Aspects of Anticlericalism in Southwest Germany during the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries. *Chicago*.

- F. C. Church, A.B. Cornell 1909, Ph.D. 1916. Boniface Amerbach and his Circle. *Cornell*.
- C. F. Lemke, A.B. Wisconsin 1903. The Opposition to Stein's Reforms in Prussia. *Chicago*.
- H. C. M. Wendell, A.B. Princeton 1910. The Evolution of Industrial Freedom in Prussia, 1845-1849. *Pennsylvania*.
- V. H. Schleicher, A.B. Indiana 1913; A.M. Columbia 1914. The Opposition to Bismarck in the Prussian Parliament. *Columbia*.
- L. D. Steefel, A.B. Harvard 1916, A.M. 1917. The Schleswig-Holstein Question, 1863-1864. *Harvard*.

NETHERLANDS

- H. E. Yntema, A.B. Hope 1912; A.M. Michigan 1913. The Theory of Sovereignty in the Netherlands. *Michigan*.

NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

- Paul Fox, A.B. Western Reserve 1906, A.M. 1908; D.B. Oberlin 1907. Phases in the Social and Economic History of Poland. *Johns Hopkins*.
- Alexander Baltzly, A.B. Harvard 1912, A.M. 1913. Russia's Entry into European Politics: Tsar Alexis Mikhailovich in the Great Northern War. *Harvard*.

THE FAR EAST AND INDIA

- J. K. Wright, A.B. Harvard 1913, A.M. 1914. A Study of European Knowledge of the Far East in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries. *Harvard*.
- Sumio Uesugi, A.M. Chicago 1916. The Family in Japan. *Chicago*.
- L. H. Davis, S.B. Pennsylvania 1901, LL.B. 1904, A.M. 1912. The Doctrine of Spheres of Influence and the Open-Door Policy in China. *Pennsylvania*.
- C. M. P. Cross, A.B. Brown 1915, A.M. 1915. The Development of Self-government in India, since 1857. *Chicago*.
- H. L. Reed, A.B. Oberlin 1911; Ph.D. Cornell 1914. The Development of a Qualified Gold Exchange Standard in India. *Cornell*.

AMERICA: GENERAL

- H. C. Beyle, A.B. Central College of Iowa 1912; A.M. Chicago 1916. Constitutional and Administrative Aspects of Tenant Legislation in the United States. *Chicago*.
- A. R. Mead, A.B. Miami; A.M. Columbia 1910. The Development of the Free School and the Abolition of Rate Bills in the States of Connecticut and Michigan. *Columbia*.
- Lucia von L. Becker, Ph.B. Chicago 1909, Ph.M. 1911. The History of the Admission of New States into the Union. *Chicago*.

- T. P. Martin, A.B. Leland Stanford 1913; A.M. California 1914. The Confirmation of Foreign Land Titles in the Acquired Territories of the United States. *Harvard*.
- V. J. West, Ph.B. Chicago 1905. History of the Corrupt Practices Acts in the United States. *Chicago*.
- C. E. Martz, A.B. Yale 1915, A.M. 1917. The Growth of the Power of the Senate. *Yale*.
- W. W. Jennings, A.B. Illinois 1915, A.M. 1916. The Origin and Early History of the Disciples of Christ in the United States. *Illinois*.
- C. B. Goodykoontz, A.B. Colorado 1912; Litt.M. California 1914. The Home Missionary Movement. *Harvard*.
- H. M. Wriston, A.B. Wesleyan 1911, A.M. 1912. Special Agents in American Diplomacy. *Harvard*.
- J. O. Hall, A.B. Denver 1903, A.M. 1905. The Norse Immigration. *Columbia*.
- G. H. Ryden, A.B. Augustana 1909; A.M. Yale 1911. Rivers and Harbors Legislation of the United States. *Yale*.
- R. J. Swenson, A.B. Minnesota 1915, A.M. 1916. River and Harbor Improvements by the United States Government. *Wisconsin*.
- L. D. White, S.B. Dartmouth 1914. Origin and Development of Regulating Commissions. *Chicago*.

AMERICA: GENERAL, ECONOMIC

- Mary J. Lanier, S.B. Chicago 1909. Geographical Influence on the Development of the Atlantic Seaports. *Chicago*.
- T. G. Gronert, A.B. Wisconsin 1908, A.M. 1915, Ph.D. 1917. The History of the Business Corporation in the United States previous to 1860. *Wisconsin*.
- W. L. Abbott, A.B. Pennsylvania 1911, A.M. 1913, LL.B. 1913. The Development of the Theory of the Tariff in the United States. *Pennsylvania*.
- F. G. Crawford, Ph.B. Alfred 1915; A.M. Wisconsin 1916. The History of Manufacturing, 1860-1870. *Wisconsin*.
- F. E. Richter, A.B. Harvard 1913, A.M. 1916. The History of the Copper Industry in the United States. *Harvard*.
- H. A. Wooster, A.B. Wesleyan 1909, A.M. 1910; Ph.D. Yale 1916. The Rise of a Wage-earning Class in New England, 1790-1860, as related to the Evolution of the Factory System. *Yale*.
- H. D. Dozier, A.B. Vanderbilt 1908; A.M. Yale 1916. The History of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad. *Yale*.
- H. H. Bass, Litt.B. Wisconsin 1902, Litt.M. 1903; A.M. Harvard 1912. The Woolen Industry in the Mississippi Valley prior to the Introduction of the Factory System. *Harvard*.
- M. K. Cameron, A.B. Princeton 1908; A.M. Harvard 1914. The History of Tobacco Growing in the Ohio Valley. *Harvard*.

- W. M. Babcock, jr., A.B. Minnesota 1914, A.M. 1915; A.M. Harvard 1917. The Relations between the Public Domain and the Cattle Industry in the United States. *Harvard*.
- E. H. Hahne, A.B. Nebraska 1911, LL.B. 1913; A.M. Harvard 1914. The History of the Meat-Packing Industry in the United States. *Harvard*.
- Clement Akerman, A.B. Georgia 1898; A.M. Harvard 1914. Studies in the Economic History of the Pacific Northwest. *Harvard*.

AMERICA: IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

- R. S. Castleman, Ph.B. Chicago 1914. Early Emigration from Spain to America. *Chicago*.
- G. A. Washburne, A.B. Ohio State 1907; A.M. Columbia 1913. Imperial Control over the Administration of Justice in the American Colonies. *Columbia*.
- J. P. Gillespie, A.B. Columbia 1905; D.B. Union Theological 1907. The Influence of Religious Ideas on American Colonial Life. *Columbia*.
- Hubert Phillips, A.B. Chattanooga 1908; A.M. Columbia 1913. The Development of the Residential Qualification on Suffrage in the American Colonies. *Columbia*.
- I. S. Mitchell, A.B. Maryville 1905. Roads and Highways as Factors in Colonial History. *Yale*.
- J. R. Young, A.B. Leland Stanford 1909, A.M. 1910. The Relation of Church and Clergy to Education in the Thirteen American Colonies. *Chicago*.
- A. H. Buffinton, A.B. Williams 1907; A.M. Harvard 1909. The Attitude of the Northern Colonies towards the Dutch and French, with special reference to the Subject of Expansion. *Harvard*.
- A. P. Scott, A.B. Princeton 1904; D.B. Chicago 1910, Ph.D. 1916. A Comparative Study of the Criminal Legislation of Massachusetts and Virginia in Colonial Times. *Chicago*.
- R. P. Bieber, A.B. Muhlenberg 1914; A.M. Pennsylvania 1915. The Lords of Trade and Plantations and the American Colonies, 1675-1696. *Pennsylvania*.
- L. S. Fuller, A.B. Smith 1904; A.M. Columbia 1905. Public Opinion in the American Colonies in the Early Eighteenth Century. *Columbia*.
- J. A. Hofto, A.B. North Dakota 1913, A.M. 1914. Sir William Johnson and Anglo-American Indian Policy, 1743-1754. *Illinois*.
- R. L. Meriwether, A.B. Wofford 1912; A.M. Columbia 1914. The Southwest Frontier, 1740-1776. *Chicago*.
- Louise F. Perring, S.B. Temple 1909; A.M. Pennsylvania 1912. The Policy of Imperial Defence in the Southern Colonies during the French and Indian War. *Pennsylvania*.
- R. A. L. Clemen, A.B. Dalhousie 1913, A.M. 1914; A.M. Harvard 1915. The Relations between New England and the Maritime Provinces of Canada, 1749-1815. *Harvard*.

- J. O. Knauss, A.B. Lehigh 1910; A.M. Harvard 1913. German-Language Newspapers in America before 1801, with a Study of Social Conditions revealed in Them. *Cornell*.
- L. H. Gipson, A.B. Idaho 1903; B.A. Oxford 1907. Jared Ingersoll, American Loyalist: a Biographical Study in the Field of British Colonial Administration. *Yale*.
- C. D. Johns, A.B. Randolph-Macon 1908; A.M. Chicago 1911. The Southern Loyalists. *Chicago*.
- E. E. Curtis, A.B. Yale 1910, A.M. 1911, Ph.D. 1916. The Organization of the British Army in the American Revolution. *Yale*.
- G. C. Wood, A.B. Syracuse 1908. Congressional Control of Foreign Relations during the American Revolution. *New York*.
- K. Schoepperle (Mrs. O. S. Beyer), A.B. Illinois 1915, A.M. 1916. A Study of the Relation between Religious and Political Liberalism in the Period of the American Revolution. *Illinois*.
- O. W. Stephenson, S.B. Michigan Agricultural 1908; A.M. Chicago 1915. The Problem of Providing Munitions for the American Revolutionary Army, 1775-1783. *Michigan*.
- G. V. Burroughs, S.B. Whitman 1909; A.M. Chicago 1912, Ph.D. 1916. Outline Development of State Constitutions from 1776 to 1851. *Chicago*.
- K. H. Porter, A.B. Michigan 1914, A.M. 1916. The Development of Suffrage in State Governments. *Chicago*.
- J. L. Deming, A.B. Cincinnati 1899; A.M. Bethany 1900. Immigration to the United States, 1776-1820: a Study in Causes and Effects. *Columbia*.
- O. R. Richards, A.B. DePauw 1910; A.M. Columbia 1915. The Movement for the Constitution of the United States. *Columbia*.
- A. L. Kohlmeier, A.B. Indiana 1908; A.M. Harvard 1911. Commerce between the United States and the Dutch from 1783 to 1789. *Harvard*.
- K. E. Carlson, A.B. Nebraska 1915, A.M. 1917. Diplomatic Relations of Sweden with the United States. *Pennsylvania*.
- Jane M. Berry, Ph.B. Chicago 1904; A.M. Columbia 1913. Relations between the United States and Spain in the Southwest between 1783 and 1795. *Chicago*.
- Vernon Stauffer, A.B. Hiram 1901. Illuminism in America. *Columbia*.
- Anna C. Clauder, A.B. Bryn Mawr 1905. The Napoleonic Wars as reflected in the Commerce to Philadelphia and New York from 1806 to 1812. *Pennsylvania*.
- G. R. Poage, Ph.B. Chicago 1916. The Early Life of Henry Clay. *Chicago*.
- R. T. Hearon, A.B. George Peabody 1906; A.M. Wisconsin 1913. The American Free-Trade Movement, 1824-1860. *Wisconsin*.
- Florence Robinson, A.M. Wisconsin 1892. Social Movements, 1825-1860. *Wisconsin*.

- D. C. Orbison, Litt.B. Princeton 1912. American Diplomatic Relations with Russia since 1824. *Pennsylvania*.
- R. F. Arragon, A.B. Northwestern 1913, A.M. 1914. The Panama Congress. *Harvard*.
- Carrie M. Lewis, A.B. Cornell 1903, Ph.D. 1916. A History of the Literature of Abolition, 1830-1840. *Cornell*.
- E. L. Fox, A.B. Randolph-Macon 1909; Ph.D. Johns Hopkins 1917. The American Colonization Society. *Johns Hopkins*.
- G. H. Barnes, A.B. Michigan 1912, A.M. 1913. The Abolitionists and the Slavery Issue as illustrated by the Struggle for Right of Petition in Congress. *Pennsylvania*.
- H. J. Reber, A.B. Wisconsin 1914. The Political Theories of Francis Lieber. *Chicago*.
- E. E. Robinson, A.B. Wisconsin 1908, A.M. 1910. Political Grouping, 1832-1840: the Rise of the Whig Party. *Wisconsin*.
- R. C. McGrane, A.B. Cincinnati 1912, A.M. 1913; Ph.D. Chicago 1915. The Crisis of 1837. *Chicago*.
- W. O. Lynch, A.B. Indiana 1903; A.M. Wisconsin 1908. A History of the Whig Party in the Northwest from 1840. *Harvard*.
- Park Carpenter, A.B. Carleton 1913; A.M. Harvard 1917. The Question of the Annexation of Santo Domingo by the United States in the Period 1844 to 1871. *Harvard*.
- J. F. Rippy, A.B. Southwestern 1913; A.M. Vanderbilt 1915. Diplomatic Relations of the United States and Mexico, 1848-1880. *California*.
- Martha L. Edwards, A.M. Wisconsin 1913, Ph.D. 1916. Religion and Politics, 1850-1860. *Wisconsin*.
- J. N. Norwood, A.B. Alfred 1906; A.M. Michigan 1909; Ph.D. Cornell 1915. The Slavery Schism in the Methodist Episcopal Church: a Study of Slavery and Ecclesiastical Politics. *Cornell*.
- I. S. Kull, A.B. Beloit 1909; A.M. Indiana 1911. The Presbyterian Church and Slavery. *Chicago*.
- W. P. Shortridge, A.B. Indiana 1907; A.M. Wisconsin 1911. The Life of Henry Hastings Sibley. *Minnesota*.
- L. T. Lowrey, S.B. Mississippi 1909, A.M. 1913; A.M. Columbia 1914. Northern Recognition of the Right of Secession, 1860-1861. *Columbia*.
- A. R. Ellingwood, A.B. Colorado College 1910; B.C.L. Oxford 1913. Diplomatic Relations between the United States and Great Britain during the Civil War. *Pennsylvania*.
- W. F. Raney, B.A. Oxford 1913. Relations between Canada and the United States, 1861-1865. *Wisconsin*.
- O. E. Hooley, A.B. Wisconsin 1910, A.M. 1912. Recruiting during the Civil War. *Wisconsin*.
- F. C. White, A.B. Alfred 1895, A.M. 1902. The Draft during the Civil War. *Columbia*.

- A. B. Moore, S.B. Auburn 1911, S.M. 1912; A.M. Chicago 1915. The Conscription Policy of the Confederate States. *Chicago*.
- G. L. Kieffer, A.B. Pennsylvania College 1909; D.B. Union Theological 1914; A.M. Columbia 1915. The Attitude of the Lutherans in America toward the Civil War and Reconstruction. *Columbia*.
- F. D. Graham, A.B. Dalhousie 1913, LL.B. 1915; A.M. Harvard 1917. The Period of Suspension of Specie Payments in the United States, 1862-1879. *Harvard*.
- K. M. Williamson, A.B. Alabama 1913; A.M. Harvard 1916. Federal Internal Taxation since 1871. *Harvard*.
- E. D. Ross, Ph.B. Syracuse 1909, Ph.M. 1910; A.M. Cornell 1912, Ph.D. 1915. The Liberal Republican Movement. *Cornell*.
- H. K. Murphey, A.B. Amherst 1913; A.M. Harvard 1916. The "Mugwumps" in the Campaign of 1884. *Wisconsin*.
- H. C. Thomas, A.B. Hamilton 1909. The Return to Power of the Democratic Party in 1884. *Columbia*.
- D. L. McMurtry, A.B. Beloit 1911; A.M. Wisconsin 1913. The History of the Pension Movement, 1885 to Present. *Wisconsin*.
- J. D. Hicks, A.B. Northwestern 1913, A.M. 1914; Ph.D. Wisconsin 1917. Western State Making, 1888-1890. *Wisconsin*.
- E. T. Fell, A.B. St. John's 1913. The Platt Amendment. *Johns Hopkins*.
- J. A. Dunaway, A.B. Park 1910, A.M. 1912. Recent Diplomatic Relations of the United States with Japan. *Pennsylvania*.
- A. C. Henry, A.B. Franklin and Marshall 1910; A.M. Pennsylvania 1915. The Influence of the United States in the Movement for International Arbitration and Peace. *Pennsylvania*.
- S. I. Sz-to, A.B. Cornell 1915, Ph.D. 1916. The Development of Police Power in American Municipalities. *Cornell*.
- C. C. Kochenderfer, A.B. Maryville College. The History of the Independent Movement in the Principal Cities of the United States. *Cornell*.
- Jeannette Keim, A.B. Wellesley 1909; A.M. Pennsylvania 1912. Recent German-American Relations. *Pennsylvania*.

AMERICA: IN LOCAL ORDER

NEW ENGLAND

- J. C. Zeller, A.B. Chicago 1904, D.B. 1905; A.M. Chattanooga 1906. History of New England Legislation on Education. *Chicago*.
- L. V. Roth, A.B. Colgate 1913; A.M. Harvard 1916. The New England Town Meeting and the American Revolution. *Harvard*.
- B. J. Baldwin, A.B. Wesleyan 1902; A.B. Yale 1903; D.B. Union Theological 1908. The Decay of the New England Parish. *Columbia*.
- H. B. Hall, S.B. Massachusetts Agricultural 1912; A.M. Harvard 1916. The Economic History of Massachusetts Agriculture, 1620-1910. *Harvard*.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XXIII.—32.

- Mary M. Goodwin, A.B. Bryn Mawr 1909, A.M. 1912. *The Colonial Agency of Massachusetts. Bryn Mawr.*
- Viola F. Barnes, A.B. Nebraska 1909, A.M. 1910. *The Relations of Massachusetts with the British Government, 1691-1740. Yale.*
- G. A. Wood, A.B. Amherst 1906. *The Career of Governor William Shirley. Columbia.*
- Blanche E. Hazard, A.B. Radcliffe 1907, A.M. 1913. *History of the Shoe Industry in Massachusetts. Radcliffe.*
- W. F. Hall, A.B. Harvard 1909, A.M. 1910. *The Political History of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island, 1830-1840. Harvard.*
- Priscilla H. Fowle, A.B. Vassar 1916. *A History of Boston Journalism, 1830-1850. Radcliffe.*
- J. W. E. Bowen, jr., A.B. Wesleyan 1911; A.M. Harvard 1913. *The Political History of Massachusetts, 1840-1850. Harvard.*
- J. V. Van Sickle, A.B. Haverford 1913. *The History of Taxation in Massachusetts since 1860. Harvard.*
- L. P. Rice, A.B. Wesleyan 1913; A.M. Harvard 1914. *The History of Taxation in Connecticut. Harvard.*
- D. Deming, A.B. Vassar 1914. *The Towns of Connecticut during the Colonial Period. Yale.*
- J. P. Senning, A.B. Union 1908. *Legislation and Legislative Methods in Connecticut since 1818. Yale.*

MIDDLE COLONIES AND STATES

- C. U. Phillips, A.B. Central 1904; A.B. Yale 1908, A.M. 1909. *The History of Manufactures in New York. Yale.*
- Arthur MacMahon, A.B. Columbia 1912, A.M. 1913. *The History of the Government of New York City. Columbia.*
- H. M. Tracey, A.B. Brown 1906; A.M. New York 1909. *Life and Influence of James Delancey. New York.*
- C. E. Miner, A.B. City of New York 1906. *The Transition from Provincial to Commonwealth Government in New York. Columbia.*
- E. G. Hobson, A.B. Boston 1895. *The History of Educational Legislation in New York, 1776-1850. Chicago.*
- M. B. Foster, A.B. Carson and Newman 1910, A.M. 1911. *A History of Banking in the State of New York. Cornell.*
- P. D. Evans, A.B. Cornell 1913, A.M. 1914, Ph.D. 1917. *The Holland Land Company and the Settlement of Western New York. Cornell.*
- L. A. Frye, A.B. Minnesota 1907, A.M. 1908. *The History of State Control of Public Service Corporations in New York. Columbia.*
- Emil Nielsen, A.B. New York 1910, A.M. 1911. *The Development of the Government of Westchester County (N. Y.), 1683-1916. New York.*
- R. H. Gabriel, A.B. Yale 1913, Ph.D. 1917. *The Economic History of Long Island. Yale.*

- F. B. Harrington, A.B. Wellesley 1906; A.M. Minnesota 1911. The History of Educational Legislation of New Jersey. *Chicago*.
- C. M. Knapp, A.B. Columbia 1914, A.M. 1914. Politics in New Jersey during the Civil War and Reconstruction. *Columbia*.
- Marguerite G. Bartlett, A.B. Bryn Mawr 1913, A.M. 1915. The Formation and Growth of the Whig Party in Pennsylvania, 1827-1840. *Pennsylvania*.
- H. R. Mueller, A.B. Muhlenberg 1909; A.M. Columbia 1915. The Last Decade of the Whig Party in Pennsylvania. *Columbia*.
- H. W. Kochenderfer, A.B. Ursinus 1901; A.M. Pennsylvania 1911. Pennsylvania during the Civil War. *Pennsylvania*.
- A. L. Trachtenberg, S.B. Trinity 1911; A.M. Yale 1912. The History of Mining Legislation in Pennsylvania. *Yale*.
- F. W. Breimeier, A.B. Bucknell 1910; A.M. Pennsylvania 1914. The Struggle for Municipal Home Rule in Pennsylvania. *Pennsylvania*.

SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

- W. M. Gevehr, Ph.B. Chicago 1911, A.M. 1912. The Great Awakening in the Southern Colonies. *Chicago*.
- H. B. Crothers, A.B. Monmouth 1903. The Attitude of Maryland, Virginia, and the Carolinas toward Defence, 1750-1756. *Yale*.
- F. J. Tschan, A.B. Loyola 1901, A.M. 1903; Ph.D. Chicago 1916. Some Aspects of the Economic History of Virginia in the Eighteenth Century. *Chicago*.
- L. K. Koontz, A.B. Washington and Lee 1908. The Virginia Frontier in the French and Indian Wars. *Johns Hopkins*.
- O. B. Ryder, A.B. Richmond 1908, A.M. 1909; A.M. Harvard 1916. The History of Banking in Virginia. *Harvard*.
- E. J. Woodhouse, A.B. Randolph-Macon 1903; LL.B. Virginia 1907. Virginia and Nullification. *Chicago*.
- W. B. Smith, A.B. Chicago 1902. White Servitude in South Carolina. *Chicago*.
- A. H. Hirsch, A.B. Cornell 1901; D.B. Chicago 1907, Ph.D. 1915. The Huguenots in South Carolina. *Chicago*.
- D. H. Bacot, jr., A.B. Charleston 1908, A.M. 1909; A.M. Harvard 1910. The Progress of South Carolina, 1783-1800. *Harvard*.
- Laura A. White, A.B. Nebraska 1904; Ph.D. Chicago 1917. The Life of Robert Barnwell Rhett. *Chicago*.
- P. M. Hamer, A.B. Wofford 1912; A.M. Trinity (N. C.) 1915. The Secession Movement in South Carolina, 1846-1852. *Pennsylvania*.
- T. H. Jack, A.B. Alabama 1902, A.M. 1903; A.M. Harvard 1908; Ph.D. Chicago 1915. Sectionalism and Party Politics in Alabama to 1842. *Chicago*.
- H. D. Billman, A.B. Dartmouth 1905; A.M. Chicago 1913. The Spanish Fur-trade in West Florida. *California*.
- T. P. Abernethy, A.B. Charleston 1912, A.M. 1912; A.M. Harvard 1915. The Formative Period in Alabama, 1817-1828. *Harvard*.

- Harriet L. Herring, A.B. Meredith 1913. *The Settlement of Alabama, 1830-1850. Radcliffe.*
- E. P. Puckett, A.B. Howard (Ala.) 1903; A.M. Tulane 1907. *The Free Negro in Louisiana. Harvard.*
- A. K. Christian, A.B. Texas 1912; A.M. 1917. *The Life of Mirabeau B. Lamar: a Study in the History of the Republic of Texas. Pennsylvania.*
- Edna Campbell, A.B. Chicago 1902, A.M. 1906. *The Geographic Influence in the Settlement and Development of the Lower Mississippi Valley. Chicago.*

WESTERN STATES

- C. J. Attig, Ph.B. Naperville 1908. *The Northwest Territory, 1787-1802. Chicago.*
- J. J. Hill, A.B. Brigham Young 1909. *American Exploration and Travel in the Far West, 1821-1849. California.*
- A. E. Stanley, A.B. Lebanon 1906; A.M. Michigan 1909. *The Early History of the Education of Women in the Northwest. Chicago.*
- B. H. Sochockel, S.B. Chicago 1911, S.M. 1913. *The Geography of the Wabash Maumee Valley. Chicago.*
- J. C. Bell, jr., A.B. Princeton 1912. *Migrations to the Northwest, 1830-1850. Columbia.*
- L. F. Jackson, A.B. North Dakota 1902; Ph.M. Chicago 1909. *The History of Protestant Missions to the Sioux and Chippewa Indians. Harvard.*
- R. S. Cotterill, A.B. Kentucky Wesleyan 1904; A.M. Virginia 1907. *Organized Railroad-Booking in the Mississippi Valley, 1837-1857. Wisconsin.*
- H. C. Hubbart, A.B. Chicago 1904, Ph.D. 1917. *Disunion Sentiment in the Northwest, 1860-1861. Chicago.*
- W. C. Spielman, A.B. Cincinnati 1905, A.M. 1907; A.M. Johns Hopkins 1915. *The Economic Basis of Ohio Politics, 1803-1870. Johns Hopkins.*
- Margaret Mitchell, Ph.B. Chicago 1911, A.M. 1913. *The Religious Development of Ohio to 1830. Chicago.*
- E. A. Miller, A.B. Oberlin 1897; A.M. Chicago 1906, Ph.D. 1915. *The History of Educational Legislation and Administration in Ohio to 1850. Chicago.*
- Clara E. Griffin, A.B. Illinois 1915. *The History of Railroads in Illinois since 1870. Illinois.*
- Ivan E. McDougale, A.B. Clark College 1915, A.M. 1916. *The Institution of Slavery in Kentucky. Clark.*
- W. B. Belknap, A.B. Yale 1908; A.M. Harvard 1915. *The Financial History of Kentucky. Harvard.*
- E. M. Coulter, A.B. University of North Carolina 1913; M.A. Wisconsin 1915, Ph.D. 1917. *Commercial Relations of Kentucky, 1815-1870. Wisconsin.*

- A. E. Martin, A.B. William Jewell 1908, A.M. 1912; Ph.D. Cornell 1915. The Anti-Slavery Movement in Kentucky to 1850. *Cornell*.
- D. S. Whittlesey, Ph.B. Chicago 1913, A.M. 1915. The History of Parties in Kentucky. *Chicago*.
- C. P. Patterson, A.B. Vanderbilt 1911, A.M. 1911; A.M. Harvard 1916. The Negro in Tennessee. *Harvard*.
- Clara Crawford, Ph.B. Chicago 1911, A.M. 1912. The History of Educational Legislation in Michigan to 1850. *Chicago*.
- J. H. Russell, A.B. Michigan 1903, A.M. 1917. Michigan Legislation, 1805-1870. *Michigan*.
- A. E. Parkins, A.M. Michigan State Normal College 1911; S.B. Chicago 1912, Ph.D. 1914. The Historical Geography of Detroit. *Chicago*.
- V. J. Farrar, A.B. Wisconsin 1911, A.M. 1912. The Public Land Policy of Wisconsin. *Wisconsin*.
- Frederick Merk, A.B. Wisconsin 1911. The Railroad History of the Granger Northwest, 1850-1873. *Harvard*.
- Gladys C. Blakey, A.B. Vassar 1913; A.M. Minnesota 1916. The Social and Economic Development of Minnesota, 1867-1880. *Minnesota*.
- C. J. Posey, S.B. Illinois 1900; S.M. Chicago 1905. The Historical Geography of St. Paul. *Chicago*.
- C. O. Sauer, A.B. Central Wesleyan 1908; Ph.D. Chicago 1916. The Historical Geography of the Ozark Region of Missouri. *Chicago*.
- B. P. Clayton, A.B. Hendrik College 1914; A.M. Chicago 1915. The Secession Movement in Arkansas. *Chicago*.
- T. S. Staples, Ph.B. Emory 1904, Central 1908; A.M. Columbia 1915. Reconstruction in Arkansas. *Columbia*.
- H. E. Jensen, A.B. Kansas 1914, A.M. 1915. The Mennonites of Kansas. *Chicago*.
- E. E. Dale, A.B. Oklahoma 1911; A.M. Harvard 1914. The History of the Range-Cattle Industry in Oklahoma. *Harvard*.
- L. E. Young, S.B. Utah 1895. The Social and Economic Development of Utah under the Leadership of Brigham Young. *Columbia*.
- A. L. Neff, A.B. Leland Stanford 1905. The Political Development of Utah. *California*.
- C. F. Coan, A.B. Washington 1908; L.M. California 1914. The Indian Policy of the United States in Oregon, 1846-1860. *California*.
- W. H. Ellison, A.B. Randolph-Macon 1904; A.M. California 1913. The Indian Policy of the United States in California, 1847-1876. *California*.
- O. C. Coy, Ph.B. College of the Pacific 1907; A.M. Leland Stanford 1909. The Settlement and Development of the Humboldt River Region, California. *California*.
- Elsie J. Grover, L.B. California 1912, L.M. 1913. The Rise and Development of Political Parties in California. *California*.

CANADA

- A. G. Dorland, A.B. Queen's 1910; A.B. Yale 1911. Newfoundland as a Fishery, 1600-1750. *Yale*.
- J. E. Howe, A.M. Acadia 1906. Historical Antecedents of the Unicameral System in New Brunswick. *Yale*.
- B. M. Stewart, A.M. Queen's 1911. Immigration and Settlement in Canada before Confederation. *Columbia*.
- W. C. Clark, A.M. Queen's 1910. The History of the Canadian Grain Trade. *Harvard*.
- R. G. Trotter, A.B. Yale 1911; A.M. Harvard 1915. The Establishment of Federal Government in Canada. *Harvard*.
- Jacob Viner, A.B. McGill 1914; A.M. Harvard 1915. The International Trade of Canada, with particular reference to the Period since 1890. *Harvard*.
- G. E. Wilson, A.M. Queen's 1914. The Life of Robert Baldwin: a Study in Canadian Politics. *Harvard*.

AMERICA, SOUTH OF THE UNITED STATES

- R. A. Vandegrift, A.B. California 1917. Military Defense in the Spanish Colonial System. *California*.
- R. R. Hill, A.B. Eureka 1900. The Office of Viceroy in Colonial Spanish America. *Columbia*.
- A. S. Aiton, A.B. California 1916. Antonio de Mendoza, first Viceroy of New Spain. *California*.
- Eleanor C. Buckley, A.B. Texas 1908, A.M. 1909. The Economic Forces underlying Latin-American Independence. *Pennsylvania*.
- J. B. Lockey, S.B. Peabody 1902, A.M. 1909. Latin America and the Monroe Doctrine. *Columbia*.
- Vera L. Brown, A.B. McGill 1912, A.M. 1913. A Study of the Audiencia in Peru. *Bryn Mawr*.
- E. E. Vann, A.B. Birmingham (Ala.) 1902; D.B. Vanderbilt 1907. The Abolition of Slavery in Brazil. *Columbia*.
- J. H. Williams, A.B. Brown 1912; A.M. Harvard 1916. The International Trade of Argentina. *Harvard*.

DISSERTATIONS PRINTED SINCE DECEMBER, 1916

- H. C. Bell, *Studies in the Trade Relations of the British West Indies and North America, 1763-1773, 1783-1793*. (Philadelphia, 1917.)
- W. S. Boyce, *Economic and Social History of Chowan County, North Carolina, 1880-1915*. (New York, Columbia Univ. Studies, vol. LXXVI, no. 1.)
- Ethel H. Brewster, *Roman Craftsmen and Tradesmen of the Early Empire*.
- F. H. Cowles, *Gaius Verres: an Historical Study*. (New York, Longmans, for Cornell University, 1917.)

- N. H. Debel, *The Veto Power of the Governor in Illinois*. (Univ. of Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences, vol. VI., nos. 1 and 2.)
- W. E. Dunn, *Spanish and French Rivalry in the Gulf Region of the United States, 1678-1702: the Beginnings of Texas and Pensacola*. (Austin, Tex., University of Texas, 1917.)
- G. W. Edwards, *New York as an Eighteenth-Century Municipality, 1731-1776*. (New York, Columbia Univ. Studies, vol. LXXV., no. 2.)
- E. C. Evans, *The History of the Australian Ballot System in the United States*. (Chicago, University Press, 1917.)
- K. B. Greenfield, *Sumptuary Law in Nürnberg*. (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Univ. Studies, in press.)
- Mary A. Hanna, *The Trade of the Delaware District before the Revolution*. (Northampton, Smith College Studies in History, vol. II., no. 4.)
- R. V. Harlow, *The History of Legislative Methods in the Period before 1825*. (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1917.)
- H. C. Hockett, *Western Influence in Political Parties to 1825: an Essay in Historical Interpretation*. (Columbus, Ohio State Univ. Studies in History and Political Science, no. 4.)
- A. A. Holtz, *The Moral and Religious Element in American Education to 1800*. (Menasha, Wis., George Banta Pub. Co., 1917.)
- M. H. Hunter, *The Development of Corporation Taxation in the State of New York*. (Privately printed.)
- R. H. Lacey, *The Equestrian Officials of Trajan and Hadrian: their Careers, with some Notes on Hadrian's Reforms*. (Princeton, University Press, 1917.)
- K. S. Latourette, *The History of Early Relations between the United States and China, 1784-1844*. (New Haven, Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Sciences, vol. XXII., no. 1.)
- T. J. Meek, *Old Babylonian Business and Legal Documents*. (Chicago, American Journal of Semitic Languages, vol. XXX., no. 3.)
- A. C. Millspaugh, *Party Organization and Machinery in Michigan since 1890*. (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Univ. Studies, ser. XXXV., no. 3.)
- P. G. Mode, *The Influence of the Black Death on the Church in England*. (Menasha, Wis., George Banta Pub. Co., 1916.)
- K. Morimoto, *The Standard of Living in Japan*. (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Univ. Studies, ser. XXXVI., no. 1.)
- D. G. Munro, *Political Conditions and International Relations of Central America*. (University of Pennsylvania, in press.)
- Mabel Newcomer, *Separation of State and Local Revenues in the United States*. (New York, Columbia Univ. Studies, vol. LXXVI., no. 2.)
- C. C. Pearson, *The Readjuster Movement in Virginia*. (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1917.)
- A. E. Peterson, *New York as an Eighteenth-Century Municipality prior to 1731*. (New York, Columbia Univ. Studies, vol. LXXV., no. 1.)

- F. W. Pitman, *The Development of the British West Indies, 1700-1763*. (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1917.)
- C. L. Powell, *English Domestic Relations, 1487-1653*. (New York, Columbia University Press, 1917.)
- R. J. Purcell, *Connecticut in Transition, 1775-1818*. (American Historical Association, in press.)
- Elizabeth F. Rogers, *Peter Lombard and the Sacramental System*. (New York, 1917.)
- Emily L. Shields, *The Cults of Lesbos*. (Menasha, Wis., George Banta Pub. Co., 1917.)
- R. W. Sockman, *The Revival of the Conventual Life in the Church of England in the Nineteenth Century*. (Privately printed.)
- G. M. Stephenson, *The Political History of the Public Lands from 1840 to 1862*. (Boston, Gorham Press, 1917.)
- Dorothy Stimson, *The Gradual Acceptance of the Copernican Theory of the Universe*. (Privately printed.)
- R. M. Tryon, *Household Manufactures in the United States*. (Chicago, University Press, 1917.)
- Hamilton Vreeland, *Hugo Grotius, the Father of the Modern Science of International Law*. (New York, Oxford University Press, 1917.)
- Ruth C. Wallerstein, *King John in Fact and Fiction*. (Philadelphia, E. Stern and Company, 1917.)
- L. E. Young, *Mine Taxation in the United States*. (Univ. of Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences, vol. V., no. 4.)

ERRATA

By error in our last number, page 230, the age of Professor Henry A. Sill was given as thirty-nine. It should have been given as forty-nine. On page 135, the signature of Dr. Robert J. Kerner of the University of Missouri, to the review of Mr. Temperley's *History of Serbia*, was erroneously spelled "Koerner"—Dr. Kerner is of Bohemian, not German origin. Also, page 145, the signature of Professor Robert H. Fife, jr., of Wesleyan University, should have been affixed to the review of Professor Ferdinand Schevill's *Making of Modern Germany*.